International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Records Management System: Its Effect on the Service Efficiency of PRC Region Iv-A

Kirby Clifford C. Guevarra

Master in Public Administration, Laguna State Polytechnic University

Abstract-
The study evaluated the impact of the Records Management System (RMS) on service efficiency at the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Region IV-A, involving 300 respondents—mostly Professional Teachers (72%), with 58.33% taking licensure exams between 2021 and 2024. Results showed that the RMS was highly effective in verifying professional records (M = 3.39), though challenges like system errors (M = 3.34, SD = 0.74) persisted. Manual processes, such as record verification and retrieval, had weak correlations with client satisfaction and employee performance. Despite this, the RMS was seen as efficient and user-friendly, significantly enhancing both client satisfaction and employee performance. The study highlighted the need for further digital transformation and automation to overcome manual inefficiencies and sustain high service standards.

Keywords: Records Management System, Verification, Client Satisfaction, Service Efficiency

INTRODUCTION

This study highlights the critical role of efficient records management in improving operations, compliance, and service delivery, particularly for government agencies like the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) Region IV-A. Given its responsibility to manage a high volume of professional records and transactions, PRC Region IV-A faced delays and inefficiencies prior to implementing a comprehensive Records Management System (RMS). A well-structured RMS enhances data organization, reduces errors and delays, improves accessibility, and ensures regulatory compliance—leading to faster, more efficient, and more transparent public service.

Despite its advantages, challenges such as manual recordkeeping and long processing times can hinder service quality. This study investigates the impact of the RMS on service efficiency at PRC Region IV-A, focusing on how it streamlines operations, boosts staff communication, and increases responsiveness. The research aims to provide insights and policy recommendations to support continuous improvement in public service delivery through better records management.

The passage outlines the vital role of the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in the Philippines, particularly in Region IV-A (CALABARZON), were rapid population growth and economic activity demand efficient service delivery. PRC is tasked with regulating over a hundred professions, making effective records management crucial. Before, PRC Region IV-A relied on manual, paper-based systems that were time-consuming, error-prone, and inefficient, often resulting in delays and lost documents. The lack of a centralized system hindered application tracking, coordination, and consistent service standards. To address these issues, PRC implemented a modern Records Management System (RMS) aimed at automating processes, improving data accuracy, reducing human error, and providing faster, more

transparent services. The RMS centralizes records digitally, allowing for quicker processing, real-time status updates, better information access, and increased employee productivity by reducing repetitive tasks. This move supports the agency's goals of modernization and enhanced public service delivery.[1]

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study highlights how improving the Records Management System (RMS) in PRC Region IV-A can enhance service efficiency, leading to faster, more accurate, and cost-effective operations. It benefits PRC staff, Records Officers, and future researchers by offering insights to improve service delivery, records handling, and future studies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study used a quantitative, descriptive-correlational research design to examine how the Records Management System (RMS) impacts service delivery at the Professional Regulation Commission.

Descriptive research, as noted by Bhat et al, (2023), helps capture the current state of a situation without altering variables, making it effective for identifying patterns and informing decisions. This approach was chosen to support the development of strategic interventions aimed at enhancing the PRC's service efficiency through an improved RMS.[2]

This study involved 300 registered professionals as participants, selected through random sampling. Due to practical limitations in surveying the entire population, the study focused on clients available at PRC offices during the survey period. As noted by Shagofah et al. (2023), random sampling is widely used in quantitative research for its fairness and effectiveness, giving each individual an equal chance of selection and ensuring unbiased representation in homogeneous groups.[3]

The research instruments utilized to study the effects of the Records Management System (RMS) on the service efficiency of PRC Region IV-A were meticulously crafted to acquire pertinent data. Interviews were included in these instruments to guarantee that quantitative-descriptive data is obtained.

In this study, the researcher utilized the questionnaire. Questionnaires are also a popular approach for data gathering in deduction because of the relative convenience and cost-effectiveness with which they were designed and distributed. Questionnaires provide generally objective data and are hence most effective.

Tracking of Records ($\alpha = 0.89$) showed good reliability, while the remaining variables demonstrated excellent reliability, with α values of 0.90 or higher. The Inventory of Records had the highest reliability score ($\alpha = 0.98$), reflecting very consistent responses within that scale.

They balance qualitative depth and quantitative insights, enabling a comprehensive comprehension of the system's strengths and areas for development.

The respondents' opinions will be assessed using a five-point Likert scale. The Likert scale enables individuals to communicate their level of agreement or disagreement with a specific statement. The scale typically offers five potential responses to a statement or query, enabling respondents to express their level of agreement or emotion as a ratio of positive to negative.[4]

Table 1. 4-Point Likert Scale for the Records Management Systems: its effect on the service efficiency of PRC Region IVA

Point	Scale	Description	Verbal Interpretation
4	*3.26-4.00*	Strongly Agree	Very High
3	*2.51-3.25*	Neutral	Average

2	*1.76-2.50*	Disagree	Low
1	*1.00-1.75*	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 1 shows that the 4-point Likert Scale will be utilized to assess the level of agreement with statements concerning the effects of the Records Management System on the service efficiency of PRC Region IV-A. The instrument was sent to the target responders using a Google Form, and the researcher also handed it to them in person. After that, the answers or results gathered for the study were put in order by adding them up and making tabulations. The results and findings in this study were explained, and conclusions and recommendations were suggested based on them.

This section of the study focuses on analyzing quantitative-descriptive data collected through surveys to assess the impact of the Records Management System (RMS) on service efficiency at PRC Region IV-A. The data analysis involved several statistical methods. Frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the respondents' demographic profiles, including the date of examination, profession, and place of examination. The weighted mean was applied to assess the level of RMS implementation and the challenges faced in service delivery. Lastly, Pearson correlation was used to examine the relationship between the level of RMS implementation and the challenges it presents, in relation to service efficiency, particularly in terms of client satisfaction and employee performance.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings were tallied, tabulated, and analyzed. The following data were interpreted using tables and figures to illuminate and better understand the study's results.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Profession

Profession	f	%
. Agricultural and Biosystems Engineer	1	0.33
Agriculturist	3	1.00
Certified Public Accountant	16	5.33
Civil Engineer	6	2.00
Criminologist	5	1.67
Fisheries Professional	1	0.33
Librarian	2	0.67
Medical Technologist	4	1.33
Midwife	1	0.33
Nurse	22	7.33
Pharmacist	3	1.00
Physician	3	1.00
Professional Forester	5	1.67
Professional Teacher	218	72.00
Psychometrician	1	0.33
Radiologic Technologist	2	0.67
Registered Electrical Engineer	6	2.00
Social Work	1	0.33
Total	300	100.00

Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents based on their professions, showing the frequency (f) and percentage (%) representation of each profession among the three hundred total respondents.

Two hundred sixteen out of 300 respondents (72%) are Professional Teachers, making them the largest group in the study. This means the study may strongly focus on the education sector, with most insights likely influenced by teachers' perspectives. Certified Public Accountants (5.33%) and Nurses (7.33%) are the next largest groups after teachers, indicating that professionals from finance and healthcare sectors are also well represented, Civil engineers (2%), registered electrical engineers (2%), and Criminologists (1.67%) show a modest presence in the sample. Several professions, such as agricultural and biosystems engineers, fisheries professionals, midwives, psychometricians, and social workers, represent only 0.33% of the total sample, one respondent each.

Table 3. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Examination.

Date of Examination	f	%
2000 and below	4	1.33
2001 – 2010	12	4.00
2011 – 2020	109	36.33
2021 – 2024	175	58.33
Total	300	100.00

The data showed that the highest number of examinations occurred between 2021 and 2024, accounting for 58.33% of the total, while fewer exams were recorded from 2011 to 2020 (36.33%), and the least occurred in 2000 and earlier (1.33%). This trend suggests a yearly increase in examinations. Demographic factors significantly influence record-keeping practices, with many small- and medium-sized entities lacking proper systems. [5]

Table 4. Demographic Profile of the Respondents in terms of Examination.

Place of Examination	f	%
Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR)	1	0.33
National Capital Region (NCR)	36	12.00
Region II	3	1.00
Region IV-A	211	70.33
Region IV-B	2	0.67
Region V	3	1.00
Total	300	100.00

This presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of examination based on place. The table shows that most respondents are from Region IV-A, obtaining a frequency of 211 with a percentage of 70.33%. About 12% are from the National Capital Region, with a frequency 36. The data shows that there are only (1) respondents from the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR), obtaining (0.33%) of the respondents.

Table 5. Level of Implementation of the Records Management System on the Delivery of Service in terms of Verification of Professional Records.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. 100% accuracy of records provided.	3.48	0.70	VHI
2. Timely process of requests.	3.35	0.72	VHI
3. The current RMS helps minimize errors.	3.34	0.74	VHI
4. Clear procedure in requesting professional records.	3.36	0.78	VHI
5. Security of professional records is in accordance with the Data Privacy Law.	3.43	0.83	VHI
Overall Mean	3.39		VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Implemented (VHI), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Implemented (HI), 1.76-2.50 = Implemented (I), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Implemented (NI).

Table 5 presents the respondents' assessment of the implementation level of the records management system in verifying professional records. The Mean (*M*) scores and standard deviations (*SD*) for each indicator are provided, along with their interpretation based on the rating scale.

The study found a very high level of implementation across all indicators (3.26–4.00), showing that respondents view the professional records verification process as efficient. The most highly rated aspect was the accuracy of records (M = 3.48), reflecting strong trust in the system. Record security also received a high score (M = 3.43), indicating confidence in data privacy compliance. However, the lowest-rated item was related to system errors (M = 3.34), suggesting that while
effective, the RMS could still be improved to minimize verification mistakes.

The overall mean score of 3.39 suggests that the Records Management System is highly effective in verifying professional records. This supports findings by Smith and Brown (2020), who highlighted digital record-keeping's role in enhancing accuracy and reducing human error.[6] Similarly, Delosa (2020) emphasized that accurate and timely record release improves service quality and resource preservation. In contrast, as noted that poor record management hinders organizational growth and leads to inefficiencies in service delivery.[7]

Table 6. Level of Implementation of Records Management System on the Delivery of Service in terms of Records Retention and Archival.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. Released of records is in prescribed time due to accessible temporary and archival records.	3.33	0.78	VHI
2. Fast Retrieval of Professional Records.	3.39	0.77	VHI
3. Proper safe keeping is maintained to secure a much effective and efficient delivery of service.	3.38	0.79	VHI
4. Clients are aware on the retention of their records.	3.34	0.80	VHI
5. Storage room is properly secured, organized and can be accessed easily for the retrieval of documents especially professional records.	3.27	0.82	VHI

Overall Mean	3.34	VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Implemented (VHI), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Implemented (HI), 1.76-2.50 = Implemented (I), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Implemented (NI).

This presents the respondents' assessment of the implementation level of the records management system in records retention and archival. The mean (*M*) scores and standard deviations (*SD*) for each indicator are provided, along with their interpretation based on the rating scale.

The study showed very high implementation across all indicators (3.26–4.00), suggesting that respondents find the professional records verification process efficient. The highest-rated indicator was the fast retrieval of records (M = 3.39), followed closely by proper safekeeping (M = 3.38), both supporting effective service delivery. The lowest-rated aspect was the organization and security of the storage room (M = 3.27), indicating a need for improvement in that area. Overall, a mean score of 3.34 reflects the RMS's high effectiveness in retention and archival, aligning with Garcia and Lopez's (2018) findings on the role of systematic archiving in boosting operational efficiency.[8]

Table 7. Level of Implementation of Records Management System on the Delivery of Service in terms of Records Inventory.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. The current system has an effective records inventory system resulting to efficient delivery service.	3.34	0.77	VHI
2. Professional Records are properly updated and corrected if needed.	3.34	0.78	VHI
3. Records are readily available.	3.36	0.76	VHI
4. Consistencies on Professional Records.	3.31	0.83	VHI
5. Records are handled with confidentiality.	3.35	0.81	VHI
Overall Mean	3.34		VHI

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Implemented (VHI), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Implemented (HI), 1.76-2.50 = Implemented (I), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Implemented (NI).

Table 7 presents the respondents' assessment of the implementation level of the records management system in terms of service delivery in records inventory. The mean (*M*) scores
and standard deviations (*SD*) for each indicator are provided, along with their interpretation based on the rating scale.

Very High implementation was observed across all indicators, ranging from 3.26 to 4.00, indicating that respondents perceive the verification process of professional records as efficient and well-implemented. The highest indicator "Records are readily available" (*M*= 3.36, *SD*= 0.76. The "Records are handled with confidentiality" indicator also received very high implementation (*M* = 3.35, *SD* = 0.81). The lowest-rated indicator is about consistency on Professional Records (*M*= 3.31, *SD*= 0.81)

The overall mean score of 3.34 indicates that the records management system is highly effective in delivering service in records inventory.

Table 8. Level of Challenges Encountered in Records Management System on the Delivery of Service in terms of Manual Verification.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. Slow processing time.	2.51	0.94	HC
2. Inconsistent in the accuracy of verified records.	2.25	0.98	LC
3. Risk of Document loss or damage.	2.35	0.96	LC
4. Manual errors could require rework or duplicate efforts for employees and clients.	2.43	0.92	LC
5. Limited Accessibility.	2.36	0.98	LC
Overall Mean	2.38		LC

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Challenging (VHC), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Challenging (HC), 1.76-2.50 = Challenging (C), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Challenging (NC).

The respondents' assessment highlights that manual verification within the Records Management System (RMS) presents moderate challenges, with an overall mean score of **3.38**. The most significant issue is slow processing time (M=2.51, SD=0.94), mainly due to paper-based
procedures and human involvement, leading to delays and potential service bottlenecks. While errors in verification exist (M=2.43, SD=0.92), they are not seen as a frequent problem.
Although issues like accuracy, security, and accessibility are not major concerns, the reliance on manual processes still contributes to inefficiencies, increased operational costs, and lower client satisfaction and employee performance. The findings support existing literature (e.g., Miller & Davis, 2021) and suggest a clear need for digital transformation and automation to enhance efficiency, reduce delays, and improve overall service delivery in RMS. [9]

Table 9. Level of Challenges Encountered by Records Management Systems in the Delivery of Service in terms of Manual Tracking of Records.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. Misplaced or unreturned record file that affects a fast delivery of service	2.37	0.96	LC
2. Difficulty of accessing the current system especially to the professional clients requesting their records.	2.42	0.95	LC
3. Manual tracking errors consume plenty of time.	2.46	0.97	LC
4. Incomplete tracking logs could affect delivery of service to meet its prescribed period of time.	2.43	0.98	LC
5. There is no clear procedure and existing system for the tracking of records.	2.37	0.97	LC
Overall Mean	2.41		L

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Challenging (VHC), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Challenging (HC), 1.76-2.50 = Challenging (C), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Challenging (NC).

The assessment of manually tracking records within the Records Management System (RMS) shows that while challenges exist, they are not severe (overall mean = 2.41). The main issue is that manual tracking errors are time-consuming (M=2.46, SD=0.97), often due to human involvement and sequential checks,

leading to service delays and bottlenecks. Incomplete tracking logs (M=2.43, SD=0.98) also pose a risk to timely service delivery.

These inefficiencies can negatively impact client satisfaction and employee workload, highlighting the need for digital transformation and automation to improve accuracy and efficiency. The findings are supported by Miller & Davis (2021), who emphasize the importance of automation, and Efe (2022), who stresses the role of good records management and a supportive work environment in enhancing administrative performance.[9][10]

Table 10. Level of Challenges Encountered in Records Management System on the Delivery of Service in terms of Manual Retrieval of Records.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. Difficulty in accessing and retrieving records using the current system that causes delay in records requests.	2.40	0.97	LC
2. Physical access limitations could hinder frontline productivity.	2.47	0.94	LC
3. Improper labeling and mishandling of records could create errors in work processes.	2.42	0.96	LC
4. Proper turnover of records is not in place.	2.32	0.95	LC
5. Manual retrieval of records is time consuming.	2.46	0.94	LC
Overall Mean	2.41		LC

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Very Highly Challenging (VHC), 2.51-3.25 = Highly Challenging (HC), 1.76-2.50 = Challenging (C), and 1.00-1.75 = Not Challenging (NC).

The assessment of challenges in manually retrieving records within the Records Management System (RMS) reveals moderate concerns, with an overall mean of **2.41**. The primary issues include **physical access limitations** (M=2.47, SD=0.94) and **time-consuming manual retrieval** (M=2.46, SD=0.94), both of which contribute to delays, inefficiencies, and service bottlenecks.

These challenges can negatively impact client satisfaction and employee performance, particularly when handling high volumes of records. Manual retrieval often requires physical access to paper documents, increasing the risk of errors such as misfiling or overlooking records, which can compromise service quality. The findings highlight the need for digital transformation and automation to enhance accuracy, speed, and overall service delivery. Supporting this, Arif T. et al, (2025) advocate for strategic investments in digital solutions to reduce manual workload and streamline records management processes.[11] Addressing these issues is essential to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the RMS.

Table 11. Level of Service Efficiency in terms of Client Satisfaction.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. The existing RMS gives the satisfaction with the accuracy of the requested records.	3.40	0.66	SA
2. The current RMS helps to minimize errors in requesting the professional records.	3.43	0.58	SA
3. The current RMS meets the required process cycle time	3.40	0.64	SA
4. The current RMS is responsive to the clients' requests.	3.35	0.64	SA
5. There is an ease in requesting records with the current RMS.	3.39	0.61	SA

Overall Mean	3.40	SA

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA), 2.51-3.25 = Agree (A), 1.76-2.50 = Disagree (D), and 1.00-1.75 = Strongly Disagree (SD).

The assessment of the Records Management System (RMS) indicates high client satisfca
satisfaction with service efficiency, reflected by an overall mean score of 3.40. Key strengths include the minimization of errors in the request process (M=3.43, SD=0.58) and the system's ability to process requests promptly (M=3.40, SD=0.64). Clients strongly agree that the RMS is accurate, responsive, and easy to use.

These findings confirm that the RMS is effectively enhancing service quality and customer experience, supporting insights from Santos (2021). While satisfaction levels are high, there is still room for improvement in areas such as responsiveness and service customization to further increase client engagement and trust.

Table 12. Level of Service Efficiency in terms of Performance Level of Employees.

Indicator	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. The existing RMS effectively managed the clients' request	3.48	0.58	SA
2. The current RMS minimized errors of employees in attending the clients' request	3.50	0.57	SA
3. Using the current RMS, it improves the accuracy of information that is use in providing service to the clients.	3.52	0.59	SA
4. The existing records management system helps you to meet deadlines or reduced time spent searching or retrieving records that you need to use in your task.	3.49	0.58	SA
5. The implementation of Records Management processes affects the employee's work performance.	3.48	0.62	SA
Overall Mean	3.50		SA

Legend. The mean is interpreted as follows 3.26-4.00 = Strongly Agree (SA), 2.51-3.25 = Agree (A), 1.76-2.50 = Disagree (D), and 1.00-1.75 = Strongly Disagree (SD).

The assessment of the Records Management System (RMS) shows strong employee performance, with an overall mean score of 3.50, indicating high client satisfaction. The system significantly improves accuracy in service delivery (M=3.52, SD=0.59) and reduces employee errors in handling requests (M=3.50, SD=0.57), leading to efficient and timely service. These findings align with research by Taylor and Wright (2022), which highlights that effective records management enhances productivity and reduces workload. Del Rosario (2023) also emphasizes the importance of accurate records for decision-making, mandate compliance, and service delivery. Overall, the RMS supports streamlined processes, better accessibility, and fewer errors, allowing employees to focus more on core responsibilities and improving overall organizational performance.[12]

Table 13. Test of the Relationship between the Implementation of Records Management Systems and Service Efficiency.

Implementation of Records Management System	Service Efficiency	
	Clients' Satisfaction	Performance level of employees
Verification of Professional Records	.602**	.480**
	Strong	Moderate
Records retention and archival	.589**	.502**
	Moderate	Moderate
Inventory of records	.656**	.574**
	Strong	Moderate

*Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001*

The analysis of correlation coefficients reveals that implementing an effective Records Management System (RMS) has a statistically significant positive impact on both client satisfaction and employee performance ($p < .01$). However, the impact is stronger on client satisfaction, indicating that efficient records management plays a critical role in enhancing the customer experience. The inventory of records shows the strongest correlation with client satisfaction ($r = .656$), highlighting the importance of a well-organized system in ensuring smooth client interactions. Other key factors, such as verification of professional records and records retention and archival, also positively contribute to service efficiency, efficiency, though to a slightly lesser extent.

These findings support the view that records management is not just a back-end administrative task but a strategic function that directly affects both service quality and organizational performance (Agu et al., 2021).[13]

Table 14. Test of the Relationship between the Challenges in the Records Management System and the Service Efficiency of Client Satisfaction and the Performance Level of Employees.

Challenges Encountered of Records Management System	Service Efficiency	
	Clients' Satisfaction	Performance level of employees
Manual verification	-0.023	-0.096
	Very Weak	Very Weak
Manual tracking of records	0.01	-0.031
	Very Weak	Very Weak
Manual retrieval of records	0.048	-0.028
	Very Weak	Very Weak

*Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001*

The correlation analysis reveals that challenges in the Records Management System (RMS)—such as manual verification, tracking, and retrieval—have an insignificant relationship with client satisfaction and employee performance. This suggests that while manual record-keeping challenges exist, they do not significantly impact overall service efficiency.

The weak correlations imply that other factors—like customer service quality, employee work efficiency, technological support, or policy enforcement—may have a greater influence on service outcomes. These suggested that employees may have adapted to manual systems or that alternative strategies are being used to offset inefficiencies. Overall, the data indicate that while improving records management is beneficial, broader organizational and operational factors play a more decisive role in driving service efficiency.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The study concludes that effective implementation of the Records Management System (RMS) significantly improves both client satisfcation
satisfaction and employee performance, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. Aspects like record verification, retention, and inventory management were particularly influential. While transitioning from manual to digital systems poses integration challenges, a phased rollout is recommended to ensure smooth adoption. Although manual challenges such as verification, tracking, and retrieval show weak overall correlations with service efficiency, they negatively impact employee performance and slightly affect client satisfaction. Addressing these challenges is essential for maximizing the benefits of the RMS.

Based on the study's findings and conclusions, several recommendations are made to improve records management and service efficiency. The researcher suggests fully implementing the current records management system to reduce errors and improve the accuracy of records. To support efficient document retrieval, especially for professional records, a secure and well-organized storage space is also recommended. Maintaining consistent, regularly updated professional records is emphasized as key to ensuring effective service delivery. Additionally, the study advocates for digital transformation and automation to streamline processes, minimize delays, and improve overall service efficiency. Digitizing centralized records is seen as a crucial step toward reducing human error, speeding up information retrieval, and enhancing the verification process, ultimately leading to more reliable and efficient operations.

REFERENCES

1. Rana, J. (2022, October 31). *7 mainstream customer satisfaction theories*. REVE Chat. https://www.revechat.com/blog/customer-satisfaction-theory/ Agu, P. C., Njoku, E. E., Umaru, S., Eleke, N. I., Nwokoma, I. H., & Bashiru, O. T. (2022). REcords Management and Organizational Performance.
2. Aziz, A., Bhat, S. A., & Rather, S. A. (2023). Temperament/Mijaz of people suffering with sciatica: A descriptive research. *International Journal of Unani and Integrative Medicine*, *7*(3), 01-03. https://doi.org/10.33545/2616454x.2023.v7.i3a.241
3. Tajik, O., Noor, S., & Golzar, J. (2023). Investigating differentiated instruction and the contributing factors to cater EFL students' needs at the collegial level.
4. McLeod, B. (2023). Art evolving: Analog or digital. https://doi.org/10.32920/23257232.v1
5. Okoli, N., & Nwoke, U. (2022). Implications of foreign companies' Reincorporation requirement in Nigeria. *Nigeria Business Law Journal*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.59080/zdmo1366
6. Smith, R., & Brown, T. (2020). The role of digital record-keeping in enhancing accuracy and efficiency. *International Journal of Records Management*, *15*(1), 22–39.
7. Delosa, J. G., A Pagara, C. R., & Manla, E. C. (2021). Research self-efficacy, interest in research and research knowledge of graduate students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social*

Science, *05*(10), 189-193. https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2021.51004

8. *Garcia*, P., & Lopez, R. (2018). Archival management and its impact on service efficiency in public institutions. *Journal of Information Systems*, *34*(2), 78–91.
9. Miller, J., & Davis, K. (2021). The effects of manual versus digital records management on organizational efficiency. *Journal of Administrative Science*, *29*(4), 56–72.
10. Efe, O. E. (2022). *Influence of records management practices, work environment and administrative effectiveness in Lagos State Judiciary, Nigeria*. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal). 6798. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/6798
11. Arif, T., Jo, B., & Park, J. H. (2025). A comprehensive survey of privacy-enhancing and trust-centric cloud-native security techniques against cyber threats. *Sensors*, *25*(8), 2350. https://doi.org/10.3390/s25082350
12. Del Rosario, W. G. (2023, March 31). 6 best record-keeping practices for every business. *D&V Philippines | Finance and Accounting Outsourcing Company*. https://www.dvphilippines.com/infographics/6-best-record-keeping-practices-for-every-businesses
13. Agu, P. C., Njoku, E. E., Umaru, S., Eleke, N. I., Nwokoma, I. H., & Bashiru, O. T. (2022). REcords Management and Organizational Performance.