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

Perceived User Awareness, Readiness, and Adaptability of Learning Commons Model in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Joana Victoria D. Capili[1], Elizabeth D. Malabanan[2]

[1]RL, LPT, MLIS, University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Philippines
[2]RL, PhD, University of Perpetual Help System Laguna, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the perceptions of user awareness, readiness, and adaptability towards the Learning Commons Model in some selected Local Government Unit (LGU) college libraries in Metro Manila. Based on Rogers' Diffusion of Innovations Theory, Bandura's Social Learning Theory, and Organizational Readiness for Change, a descriptive-correlational approach was used in this study wherein the relationship of various factors affecting the users' response to the Learning Commons Model will be determined. Survey questionnaires with high reliability indices were distributed to 365 college students at the Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College.

Results have shown that respondents were moderately aware (M = 3.19) regarding the Learning Commons across the three environments, where their awareness is higher when it comes to sociocultural and physical dimensions compared to their virtual services. However, it was also found out that the respondents have a high level of readiness (M = 3.38) which means that there was a willingness to use the Learning Commons resources. Also, respondents displayed adaptability in the Learning Commons ranging from moderate to highly adaptive (overall M ≈ 3.30). This shows that students can change their way of learning depending on the environment offered by the Learning Commons especially in physical and sociocultural spaces, but less so in virtual spaces due to difficulty in navigation.

Moreover, the correlation test resulted in significant relationships between awareness, readiness, and adaptability of the Learning Commons users. The higher the awareness, the higher the readiness which consequently results in user adaptability. The research identified a gap between awareness and utilization specifically in virtual and specialized services which suggests the need to improve the orientation, marketing, and promotion, as well as user digital literacy. Also observed was a contextual issue since the Learning Commons is situated within resource-limited LGU institutions. Based on this study, an action plan is recommended to address the issue.

Keywords: Learning Commons Model, Library User Perception, Physical Commons, Virtual Commons, Sociocultural Commons, Metro Manila, Local Universities and Colleges (LUC), Local Government Unit (LGU) Colleges

INTRODUCTION

From being mere collections of books, academic libraries have now transformed into learning spaces where learners interact and actively learn while integrating technology into their studies. This evolution has contributed to the development of the Learning Commons Model – an educational environment where learners benefit from using physical, virtual, and sociocultural spaces in order to collaborate with other learners and produce new knowledge (Wong & Li, 2023; Sun et al., 2024). Yet, although academic libraries have undergone a lot of changes, there still exists a gap in the effectiveness of using these spaces. The efficient application of the Learning Commons Model is closely connected to how well users engage with the library services and the way they use library spaces, which, in turn, depends on several factors: user awareness, readiness, and adaptability. While previous studies indicate the importance of awareness in the utilization of the academic library services (Thakor, 2023; Beneyat-Dulagan & Cabonero, 2023), being aware of the available opportunities is not enough in order to use library services and facilities effectively. Being ready to use these services also matters because the lack of skills, insufficient access to necessary technologies, and insufficient institutional support make it difficult for students to benefit even when they have access to all available infrastructure (Masrek, 2025; Baidoo & Nwagwu, 2024). Finally, another crucial point in relation to the efficient application of the Learning Commons Model is adaptability. Recent research shows that having access to collaborative spaces in no way guarantees improvement of academic performance in case the learner continues adhering to individual study approaches (Sun, Quinto, & Orillo, 2024).

Learning Commons Model is one of the most promising practices for well-endowed academic institutions. Yet, the introduction of the model in LUCs especially those run by LGUs is fraught with certain challenges. As emphasized by Catchuela and De Jesus (2026), the proliferation of such schools increases access to tertiary education yet at the same time generates differences in their institutional capacities. Formed following the principles set out by the Local Government Code of 1991, they have a strong focus on democratizing education and training professionals able to compete in today's globalized world. Yet, inequalities in financing, physical conditions, personnel, and provision of auxiliary services still persist (Biray & Delos Santos, 2025). Thus, the implementation of Learning Commons and related user experience may be affected by such external pressures.

Some examples of local government colleges located within Metro Manila include Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College. Both colleges try to ensure that all of their students can get relevant education regardless of limited resources. Their libraries serve multiple groups of students and need to meet their requirements ranging from traditional to technology-related. However, there are no studies dedicated to examining how the users identify, exploit and adapt Learning Commons principles.While there is an increasing amount of literature written about the Learning Commons Model, most of the studies have been done on institutions with enough funding and in well-developed educational systems. What is more important, there is an evident lack of localization and empirical evidence regarding students' interactions with the Learning Commons initiative in the Philippine context. Specifically, most of the literature covers general issues connected to library services without paying attention to aspects such as awareness, readiness, and adaptability of the users in their specific environment.

In this case, this gap gains importance because colleges sponsored by LGUs function within specific conditions that are affected by local government regulations and national standards for quality assurance. In such a case, the impact of these elements on the functioning of the Learning Commons approach may

be different in each college, and therefore it would be very difficult to generalize results from national studies into the local setting.

In light of the above discussion, the present study adopted the descriptive-correlational method as a means of evaluating the level of awareness, preparedness, and adaptability of the students regarding the Learning Commons Model in selected LGU college libraries within the Metro Manila. In addition, the study aimed at identifying the existing correlations between the considered factors. The results can be used by librarians as empirical grounds for planning and developing the Learning Commons Model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Learning Commons Model in Academic Libraries

The shift from traditional academic libraries to the Learning Commons implies both structural changes and institutional transformation. While the former focused on collecting materials, the latter prioritizes the creation of interactive and collaborative learning environments (Odonnell and Anderson, 2021). At the same time, the issue of institutions' willingness to embrace pedagogical shifts and simply repackaging existing services arises. Therefore, the examination of the model is required not only at the level of innovation but also in terms of implementation and application to various institutional frameworks.

Physical space is one of the essential elements of the Learning Commons. It is proven that flexible design, maker environments, and informal learning zones increase collaboration and creative output (Roucaud, 2024; Lotfy et al., 2022). Nonetheless, such research emphasizes the importance of integrating changes into instructional processes and addressing user needs.

The digital space constitutes another significant part of the model. According to Almeida et al. (2023), successful Learning Commons adoption requires the seamless integration of physical and digital services. The assumption is based on the sufficient digital literacy and access of users.

Finally, the sociocultural perspective suggests considering libraries as environments where academic and social interactions take place. Williams et al. (2021) prove that the success of these interactions depends on institutional policies and technological opportunities. In other words, the Learning Commons works within a particular organizational context. The adaptability of the Learning Commons was evidenced by the example of the pandemic period. As reported by Leung et al. (2021), despite stable levels of users' engagement, the current planning strategies could not address the requirements of hybrid learning. Additionally, the positioning strategy, including architecture, innovation, leadership, and branding, increases the sustainability and visibility of the Learning Commons (Sahli et al., 2023). In turn, the latter repositions libraries as active participants in the academic environment.

Perceived User Awareness in Physical Commons

User awareness in physical commons is defined as the level of familiarity with the use of the library as an area for effective learning. In library literature, the notion of "library as space" continues to be one of the major concepts, which underlines the significance of physical environments for institutions and their clients. As explained by Dery et al. (2025), despite changes in approaches to service delivery, physical aspects still play an important role; therefore, user awareness should still exist. Nevertheless, regardless of advanced technological facilities that could contribute to learning, students can fail to utilize these opportunities due to insufficient communication. The idea seems to be consistent with the opinion expressed by Utami (2023) about Learning Commons as an integrated space for studying, collaboration, and leisure with the help of technologies. Thus, user awareness should include information about what facilities are available for users, as well as how to utilize them to benefit academic progress. There are a

number of studies that highlight the connection between physical spaces and user awareness. For instance, Cruz and Barsaga (2020) revealed that learners conduct multiple activities such as writing academic papers, discussing topics, and using computers in libraries. However, even though the evidence implies that students actively use these spaces, it does not prove that users are aware of their purposes. Thus, users may act without being aware of the potential of available resources. In terms of regulations in the Philippines, there are several legal acts that require providing enough learning spaces for students. Namely, Republic Act No. 7722 and Republic Act No. 9246 determine the minimum standards of libraries in higher education institutions. In addition, CHED Memorandum Order No. 22, Series of 2021 states the necessity to provide discussion, creation, and innovation spaces along with proper environmental conditions. Nonetheless, it means that legislation does not pay attention to user awareness; thus, its lack is inevitable. A deeper understanding of user awareness could be achieved through exploring user requirements. According to Ubat and Academia (2025), students need accessible, comfortable, sociable, and resource-efficient areas. Therefore, considering that users' actions are directly affected by environment, awareness might be improved by creating a convenient environment.

Perceived User Awareness in Virtual Commons

Perceived user awareness in virtual commons refers to users' knowledge and understanding of available digital library services. Liwaden-Galut and Cabonero (2024) emphasize that academic libraries must move beyond static "information commons" toward dynamic learning commons to maximize user potential. However, users can only benefit from these services if they are aware of them. In many cases, complex technologies limit user awareness, suggesting that the success of virtual libraries depends not only on infrastructure but also on users' knowledge of available resources.

Empirical studies show a strong relationship between awareness and usage of virtual services. Panhilason (2024) found that higher awareness leads to increased frequency of use and higher satisfaction. However, awareness alone does not guarantee meaningful engagement. This indicates the need for continuous communication and orientation programs to support effective use of digital services. Institutional initiatives further illustrate the role of awareness. The "Information Marathon" project at Southern Leyte State University (2025) highlights the importance of information literacy training in helping students use digital resources effectively. While such initiatives improve technical skills, their impact on sustained awareness depends on their continuous implementation. Thus, they support awareness but may not be sufficient on their own.

Virtual reference services (VRS) provide another perspective on awareness. Tsang and Chiu (2022) found that students value instant messaging services due to their convenience. This suggests that usage may be driven more by ease of access than by full awareness of available features. Therefore, user awareness is influenced not only by institutional promotion but also by usability and user experience.

Perceived User Awareness in Sociocultural Commons

User awareness in sociocultural commons involves how the users understand the library as both an academic and social space. Even with higher participation, the users have little knowledge about the cooperative nature of the Learning Commons (Sun, Orillo, and Quinto, 2025). Not only cognitive but also the emotional and social aspects contribute to user awareness. Ruelle (2024) explains how inclusion and exclusion play critical roles in user perceptions, whereas DeFrain and Hong (2022) argue that students tend to reframe cooperative learning spaces into personal spaces. The discrepancy between the intentions of the institution and the users also contributes to user awareness. According to Mangrum and Foster (2020), students perceive spaces as adaptable places rather than collaborative ones. Thus, user awareness

is affected by academic experiences, context, and interactions. User awareness should be sustained through ongoing evaluation and behavioral alignment (Khan, 2024; Patrick and Oyovwe-Tinuoye, 2020).

Perceived User Readiness in Physical Commons

Jain (2023) states that modern academic libraries should be considered "labs for knowledge creation." It means that space with plenty of technologies designed based on the needs of people who will use the room is capable of creating more opportunities for collaboration and creativity. At the same time, an improvement cannot automatically be viewed as having a positive effect on user readiness because people will be able to enjoy the benefits of the facility only when they are aware of its potential and can exploit it. Increased space functionality emphasized by Beneyat-Dulagan and Cabonero (2023) is also important for user readiness. In turn, enhanced functionality makes the space more difficult to navigate in for unprepared individuals. As a result, expanding facilities and providing more services without informing users about them may become counterproductive. The psychological dimension of user readiness in academic libraries also matters. According to Samo, Sittie, and Agcito (2024), libraries should be viewed as "therapeutic landscapes" which contribute to overcoming emotional barriers. In such environments, it becomes easier for individuals to collaborate and participate in academic activities. Finally, empirical studies reveal other aspects that affect user readiness. In particular, environmental issues were revealed to play a major role in user interaction and engagement by Dianing and Acedera (2025). Namely, they found that lighting, acoustic elements, and presence of greenery are important in this regard. The researchers did not find any significant relationship between the presence of advanced technologies and increased user engagement. The same conclusion was reached by Peng et al. (2022) with respect to comfort factors like ventilation, ergonomic furniture, and acoustics.

Perceived User Readiness in Virtual Commons

In virtual commons, the mismatch between the availability of services and the capability of users to leverage the potential of digital platforms poses another challenge, making one think of the real readiness of users. Majhid and Lakshmi (2025) observe that even though students have a positive attitude towards e-learning, they lack the necessary digital skills and self-efficacy to take advantage of them. The existence of technology cannot be assumed to indicate readiness since readiness involves other considerations such as technical competence and confidence. The use of both physical and virtual spaces in education adds another aspect to the state of readiness. As noted by Zhou et al. (2021), students heavily depend on smartphones and online spaces in their learning processes. As a result, readiness is not simply a matter of access and use but coordination of multiple technological systems, thus adding a cognitive dimension to this phenomenon. In addition, readiness is multi-dimensional. Several institutional factors influence readiness too. Hamad, Al-Fadel, and Fakhouri (2023) observed that the deployment of smart library services is met with some degree of resistance among the students due to their fears and uncertainties regarding the new system. The deployment of a technological solution requires more than availability, including reliability, proper training, and adequate infrastructure, among others. An example drawn from a resource-strapped institution proves that readiness is also influenced by various considerations. According to Mabry (2025), a rural university used various user-centric measures, including digitization of content and provision of creative production spaces, to enhance the readiness of users to make the best use of the library system.

Perceived User Readiness in Sociocultural Commons

According to LaFleur (2020), effective Learning Commons implementation necessitates high-level collaboration between the research support services, computing services, and multimedia. In other words,

non-collaboration affects negatively users' perception of a collaborative environment, thus negatively impacting readiness because of the service nature of a library instead of being an interactive place. Therefore, the level of readiness should be determined by both structural and perceptive factors. The integration of physical and virtual Learning Commons components similarly impacts readiness as measured by students' perception of sociocultural opportunities. According to Garoufali & Garoufallou (2024), many libraries continue to be perceived as mere information centers with limited technology integration. From the perspective of a user, this means that such conditions reduce the level of his/her readiness to engage in collaborative tasks and encourage independent learning instead. The institution's capacity for implementing Learning Commons may significantly impact readiness. Biray & Santos, Jr. (2025) identified several constraining factors including lack of funding, inadequate space, and regulatory requirements. Users may perceive such constraints through inadequate study spaces and insufficient access to improved learning opportunities. Likewise, Balicat (2025) reports that while students are interested in using library services, poor access to the Internet and negative study environments discourage them from doing so. Lastly, environmental design also contributes to readiness through users' perceptions. According to Sabroso (2025), it is important to design flexible learning spaces to help learners engage in academic activities. At the same time, aspects like lighting, cleanliness, and aesthetics also contribute positively to users' comfort, motivation, and willingness to collaborate. Navarro et al. (2023) also emphasize the need for ongoing improvement of the environment.

Perceived User Adaptability in Physical Commons

Yang and Kim (2022) highlight the necessity of creating adaptive learning environments in academic libraries that will provide for different types of learning among students in the post-pandemic era. However, perceived adaptability is not defined solely by the presence of diverse learning zones. Perceived adaptability is based on students' ability to recognize these zones and adapt their behavior to the space around them. It requires an awareness of the purpose of each learning space and an ability to change the learning style depending on the nature of the space. The lack of flexibility and ambiguity in the arrangement of spaces is another barrier to adaptability because students prefer staying in spaces with which they are familiar rather than trying new zones. Research demonstrates a positive correlation between adaptability, spatial clarity, and the level of user satisfaction with the spaces. For instance, Tokuwaki et al. (2024) find that unclear differentiation between quiet zones, collaborative areas, and social spaces reduces user satisfaction. Also, Chaddha and Kanjilal (2022) report that the absence of flexible zones limits students' opportunity to switch between individual and collaborative learning. Nonetheless, adaptability is not impossible to achieve. Students have ways to create informality and make the necessary adaptations despite lacking clarity in the spatial design. For instance, they can switch seats and locations, stay in habitual zones, or adapt group areas. These findings suggest that although adaptability is compromised, the process continues despite lacking clear spatial arrangement. Research focused on framework analysis demonstrates that adaptability is dependent on the compatibility of design intention and users' understanding of this intention. According to Flores et al. (2021), learning environments need to be designed with consideration for users' characteristics and the institution's system alongside with spatial planning. However, adaptability is achieved when users fully understand these design intentions. Thus, the lack of adaptability may stem from unclear spatial intentions. Leijon et al. (2022) highlight the lack of a connection between the spatial design and actual user behavior observed in research on learning spaces. In turn, Riratanaphong (2024) argues that library spaces do not correspond to students' needs and preferences, making them opt for other study locations.

Perceived User Adaptability in Virtual Commons

The development of modern academic libraries implies the creation of digital knowledge ecosystems based on adaptive technologies and personalization systems. As Sharma et al. (2025) state, Artificial Intelligence allows creating a personalized assessment system of learners. However, technological innovation implies increased levels of complexity of information environments, thus making greater adaptability necessary. In other words, adaptability is a result of the development of the system's logic, which must be mastered to learn efficiently. The importance of adaptability increases further in the case of next-generation digital learning environments (NDLEs). According to Ling Koh and Pei Kan (2020), NDLEs are characterized by interoperability, multifunctionality, and personalization, making them cognitively demanding for learners. It implies that selective adaptation, which means limited use of platform features without their proper integration into the learning process, occurs quite frequently among students. It is important to emphasize the role played by institutional factors in the formation of adaptability. For instance, as Ali et al. (2025) point out, the lack of funds, appropriate technology, and relevant staff expertise limits the effectiveness of implementation of innovations in institutions. Similarly, Ojobor (2024) claims that digital literacy cannot be achieved without continued training of users. Hence, instability and poor implementation create obstacles to the development of adaptability in individuals. Moreover, the role played by adaptability at an organizational level depends on how well strategy implementation results in user experience. Aslam (2021) emphasizes that technological changes and changing preferences of users motivate organizations to make certain adaptations but do not always result in users' adaptability. In other words, adaptability happens only when changes are consistent with real practices of users rather than administrative strategies.

In addition, modern academic libraries are characterized by the integration of various platforms. According to Jain and Behera (2023), academic libraries are knowledge ecosystems combining physical and digital resources. Therefore, adaptability implies coordination between multiple technologies used in academic libraries.

Perceived User Adaptability in Sociocultural Commons

Perceived user adaptability in sociocultural commons is related to students' capability to adapt their academic and social behavior to the interaction-oriented nature of the environment provided by the library. It is worth mentioning that adaptability does not emerge with the mere existence of sociocultural spaces, but is highly dependent on the degree to which the interactional social norms inherent in the environment are recognized by the users. According to Depano-Panganiban (2023), the lack of stakeholders' involvement and the resistance to change prevent the effective implementation of Learning Commons, leading to the underdevelopment of social environments. The result is low user adaptability and a preference for individual actions rather than collaboration. Similar findings by Ojobor (2024) reveal that inadequate infrastructure, low budgetary support, system instability, and lack of staff capabilities create barriers for continuous interactions and mentoring of students, preventing them from developing adaptive actions as a result of the unstable and unpredictable environment. In addition, perceived user adaptability depends on whether the environment sends appropriate signals to its users. According to Purbarsari et al. (2025), the interactional spaces foster the formation of both cognitive and behavioral adaptations that enable shifting between individual and collaborative modes of learning. Still, such adaptability can only be achieved if users understand and acknowledge the social norms associated with interactional environments and view them as positive contributors to education. Corrall (2022) stresses that transforming libraries into relational and community spaces requires efforts to enhance users' awareness.

In other words, user adaptability not only depends on the existence of social spaces, but also on their correct interpretation by users. Interventionist strategies also point out that adaptability should be learned through deliberate practice. Curry (2023), relying on the principles of cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT), shows that making spaces encourage interaction only when they are used along with educational curricula and with the help of the staff. Finally, it can be concluded that the creation of hybrid sociocultural environments adds up to the issue. As noted by Dobrovolska et al. (2022), new technologies create a possibility of transferring social interaction to the online mode, while according to Khan et al. (2020), the use of social networks facilitates communication. In this case, however, it should be taken into account that the users have to manage several different interactional channels.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The researcher employed a descriptive correlational design to determine users' perceived awareness, readiness, and adaptability regarding the Learning Commons model in selected Local Government Unit college libraries in Metro Manila. As explained by Aprecia et al. (2022), descriptive–correlational research design describes variables as they naturally occur and measures the extent of relationships among them. This design does not seek to establish causation but rather to determine whether associations exist between variables. Since the study aims to assess perceptions and relationships rather than implement an intervention or experimental treatment, this design is deemed most suitable. Descriptively, the study measured the extent to which students are aware of, prepared for, and able to adapt to Learning Commons services. Correlational analyses determined whether significant relationships exist among these variables—specifically, whether awareness is associated with readiness and whether readiness is associated with adaptability. Moreover, this method is ideal for situations involving education and library research, where factors such as awareness, readiness, and adaptability have behavioral and perceptual qualities. Results of the study will provide baseline information for the creation of new programs or policies that would eventually implement the concept of Learning Commons in college libraries under the local government unit.

Sources of Data

Data were gathered via survey questionnaires conducted on the targeted respondents, which consisted of selected college undergraduates from both Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College. These data gathered were primary, quantitative in nature, and were conducted to gauge their level of awareness and adaptability towards the Learning Commons Model framework.

Population of the Study

The population included 7,033 undergraduate students enrolled in the Second Semester of Academic Year 2025-2026, where there were 4,300 students in Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and 2,733 students in Parañaque City College. The sample was obtained through the stratified random sampling method, where respondents were selected proportionally from each school according to the size of their population. It yielded 223 respondents from Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College and 142 respondents from Parañaque City College, totaling 365. According to the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator, the necessary number of respondents with a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level should be 365 respondents. They were regular users of the physical and virtual libraries and were interviewed within two weeks of distribution. The respondents were chosen based on whether or not they were regular users of the library. In this case, being a regular user is operationalized as using the physical or digital library

services at least once per week and/or using the library resources regularly for academic purposes in the current semester. This ensures that respondents were exposed enough to be able to comment about Learning Commons-related services. This, however, means that the results obtained can only be applied to library users.

Instrumentation and Validation

Data was collected through self-made questionnaire administered to the selected students of Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College. The questionnaire consists of three sections. Section 1 contained questions on user awareness, Section 2 focused on questions about user readiness, and Section 3 covered questions about user adaptability towards the Learning Commons Model. Validation was conducted using face and content analysis by three experts in library and information science and academic research. Experts validated the instrument based on a validation rubric assessing the clarity, relevancy, and appropriateness of the indicators in the tool. Comments and recommendations from the panel were incorporated in the final revisions of the tool. After validation, the tool was tested for reliability using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient among 15 respondents who did not participate in the study. Excellent reliability indices were obtained, which were 0.921 for user awareness, 0.928 for user readiness, and 0.939 for user adaptability, suggesting that the tool is highly reliable for data collection.

Data Gathering Procedure

Request letters were obtained from the respective Officer in Charge or Administrative Head of the local colleges for permission to conduct the research. Upon approval of the request, the researcher administered the questionnaires to the study's respondents online. The respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their responses as part of the study's ethical considerations. Participants' informed consent was incorporated into the survey questionnaire, including the rationale and purpose of the study, risks and benefits, and the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. The completed questionnaires were collected, tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. Thereafter, the data were entered into a spreadsheet and reviewed by a statistician to determine appropriate statistical treatment and to provide an initial analysis.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools were used in this study:

1. **Weighted mean and ranking** were used to determine the level of awareness, readiness, and adaptability of the Learning Commons Model among selected students of Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College.
2. **Pearson Product-Moment correlation** was used to measure the degree and direction of the relationship between the level of awareness, readiness, and adaptability of the Learning Commons Model among selected students of Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College.

RESULTS

1. Level of Awareness on Learning Commons Model in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 4

Overall Level of Awareness on Learning Commons Model

Domains	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Physical Commons	3.22	Moderately Aware	2

Virtual Commons	3.10	Moderately Aware	3
Sociocultural Commons	3.24	Moderately Aware	1
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.19**	**Moderately Aware**	

2. Level of Readiness towards Learning Commons Model in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 8

Overall Level of Readiness on Learning Commons Model

Domains	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Physical Commons	3.38	Highly Ready	2
Virtual Commons	3.24	Moderately Ready	3
Sociocultural Commons	3.26	Highly Ready	1
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.29**	**Highly Ready**	

3. Level of Adaptability towards Learning Commons Model in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 12 Overall Level of Adaptability for Learning Commons Model

Domains	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Physical Commons	3.30	Highly Adaptable	2
Virtual Commons	3.32	Highly Adaptable	3
Sociocultural Commons	3.34	Highly Adaptable	1
Overall Weighted Mean	**3.32**	**Highly Adaptable**	

4. Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Readiness for the Learning Commons in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 13 Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Readiness for the Learning Commons Model

	Pearson r value	p-value	Interpretation
Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and Level of Readiness for Learning Commons Model	0.742** Strong correlation	< .001	Significant
** Significant @ .05			

5. Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Adaptability for the Learning Commons in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 14 Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and the Level of Adaptability for the Learning Commons Model

	Pearson r value	p-value	Interpretation
Relationship Between the Level of Awareness and Level of Adaptability for Learning Commons Model	0.692** Strong correlation	< .001	Significant
** Significant @ .05			

6. Relationship Between the Level of Readiness and the Level of Adaptability for the Learning Commons in Selected Local Government Unit College Libraries in Metro Manila

Table 15 Relationship Between the Level of Readiness and Level of Adaptability for Learning Commons Model

	Pearson r value	p-value	Interpretation
Relationship Between the Level of Readiness and Level of Adaptability for Learning Commons Model	0.784** Strong correlation	< .001	Significant
** Significant @ .05			

DISCUSSION

1. From Table 4, there is a moderate level of students' awareness of the Learning Commons Model in terms of their responses (WM = 3.19). It means that students are aware of the role and activities of the library. Among all the domains, Sociocultural Commons had the highest awareness (WM = 3.24) while Physical Commons was at par with it in second place (WM = 3.22) while the least was seen for Virtual Commons (WM = 3.10). This finding shows that students are more aware of the social environment and physical aspects rather than its virtual components. In order to increase awareness, promotion and orientation are required among students, especially regarding the virtual aspect of the library. It supports the works of Dery et al. (2025), Liwaden-Galut and Cabonero (2024), and Sun et al. (2025).
2. As presented in Table 8, the students exhibited a high readiness for the Learning Commons Model (WM = 3.29). The Physical Commons had the highest score (WM = 3.38), then Sociocultural Commons (WM = 3.26), followed by Virtual Commons (WM = 3.24). This implies that students are ready and willing to implement the model. A high score on the Physical Commons underscores the need for a conducive environment, which is a point Sabroso (2025) emphasizes. The findings on the Sociocultural Commons also confirm LaFleur's (2020) assertion regarding collaborative efforts and provision of support services. While not as high as the first two scores, the Virtual Commons score confirms the findings of Garoufali and Garoufallou (2024) that technological integration often follows the creation of physical spaces. Nevertheless, Biray and Santos, Jr. (2025) and Balicat (2025) support that the students were ready for Learning Commons despite resource constraints.
3. As can be seen from Table 12, students have demonstrated a high degree of adaptability to the Learning Commons Model (WM = 3.32). Students are flexible when it comes to adapting to the physical, virtual, and sociocultural environment of the library. Consistent scores in terms of mean scores indicate similar experience across domains. Sociocultural Commons received the highest score (WM = 3.34) followed by Virtual Commons (WM = 3.32) and Physical Commons (WM = 3.30) with the interpretation "Highly Adaptable." These results prove that institutional support and interaction positively influence user adaptability. The Virtual Commons scores suggest that students are flexible to existing technologies but probably do not use advanced functions available in those technologies. Scores for Physical Commons imply that students are adaptable thanks to space, but this factor works less effectively than the previous two. Corrall (2022) and Depano-Panganiban (2023) provide insights regarding institutional support. Technological adaptability can be explained by the findings of Sharma et al. (2025), Ling Koh and Pei Kan (2020), and Ojobor (2024). Finally, Physical Commons can be explained by the insights of Yang and Kim (2022) and Tokuwaki et al. (2024). In turn, Curry (2023)

and Purbarsari et al. (2025) argue about the importance of matching social, technological, and physical factors to user needs.

4. Table 13 shows a strong positive relationship between awareness and readiness ($r = 0.742$, $p = 0.001$). This indicates that students with higher awareness of the Learning Commons Model are more prepared to use it. The findings are consistent with Panhilason (2024), who highlights the role of awareness in effective library use, and Majhid and Lakshmi (2024), who emphasize familiarity in digital readiness. In the context of physical and sociocultural spaces, Yang and Kim (2022) and Depano-Panganiban (2023) also suggest that knowledge of library features enhances readiness.
5. Table 14 reveals a strong positive relationship between awareness and adaptability ($r = 0.692$, $p < .001$). This suggests that students with higher awareness are more likely to adapt to the Learning Commons Model. However, the slightly lower correlation indicates that adaptability is not solely dependent on awareness. While awareness provides knowledge of available resources, adaptability requires skills, experience, and opportunities for application. Thus, awareness is necessary but not sufficient for adaptability. These findings are supported by Yang and Kim (2022) and Tokuwaki et al. (2024) for physical spaces, Sharma et al. (2025), Ling Koh and Pei Kan (2020), and Ali et al. (2025) for digital environments, and Depano Panganiban (2023), Corrall (2022), and Purbarsari et al. (2025) for sociocultural contexts.
6. As shown in Table 15, there is a very strong positive relationship between readiness and adaptability ($r = 0.784$, $p = 0.001$). This indicates that students who feel prepared—both in terms of skills and confidence—are more likely to adapt to changes in physical, virtual, and sociocultural environments. However, readiness does not automatically lead to adaptability, as the latter involves actual behavioral adjustment. In physical spaces, Jain (2023), Beneyat-Dulagan and Cabonero (2023), and Samo et al. (2024) emphasize the role of supportive and flexible environments in fostering engagement. In virtual contexts, Majhid and Lakshmi (2024) and Zhou et al. (2021) highlight the importance of digital skills, while Hamad et al. (2023) note that readiness alone is insufficient without proper infrastructure. In sociocultural settings, LaFleur (2020) and Corrall (2022) stress collaboration, while Garoufali and Garoufallou (2024) and Biray and Santos Jr. (2025) point to resource limitations. Overall, readiness is a strong predictor of adaptability, but its effectiveness depends on supportive conditions and opportunities for application.
7. The Learning Commons Model should be adopted in LGU college libraries of Metro Manila. In this case, it would be necessary to take appropriate measures including assessment of library resources, organizing campaigns for spreading the idea of Learning Commons in colleges, developing the model, and continuous monitoring of its use.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the summary of findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The students enrolled at Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College of Las Piñas and Parañaque City College possess basic knowledge and understanding of the Learning Commons Model, but only to a certain degree. Their knowledge is related to visibly available and frequently accessed services, thus pointing out only a surface-level understanding of the model.
2. The students are characterized by high levels of readiness for using Learning Commons environments, especially physical ones. They express great willingness for being immersed in new types of learning environments, while being unprepared because of insufficient awareness.

3. The students are characterized by high levels of adaptability for using the Learning Commons Model in higher education. Nevertheless, their adaptability is rather practical and does not include any strategies for successful adaptation due to lack of awareness and insufficient access to all services provided by the model.
4. Awareness of the Learning Commons Model is strongly connected with readiness for working in such a learning environment. Hence, awareness is seen as an important component of readiness for the usage of the model.
5. Awareness has a significant impact on adaptability of the students, suggesting that the more information is known about the Learning Commons Model, the easier it would be for them to adapt to the new environment. Otherwise, their adaptability will be limited due to low levels of awareness.
6. There is a clear relationship between readiness and adaptability of the students towards Learning Commons in higher education. Being ready helps the respondents to adapt to new environments much faster.
7. The Learning Commons Model should be adopted in LGU college libraries of Metro Manila. In this case, it would be necessary to take appropriate measures including assessment of library resources, organizing campaigns for spreading the idea of Learning Commons in colleges, developing the model, and continuous monitoring of its use.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher extends her most sincere appreciation and gratitude to all those who have been instrumental in making this study possible.

To **Dr. Elizabeth D. Malabanan**, her thesis adviser, for her wise counsel and expertise which were very much appreciated. Her invaluable support and encouragement have greatly facilitated the successful completion of this study.

To **Dr. Ma. Lindie M. Masalinto**, for her encouragement and support by graciously offering her time and presence during the panel defense.

To the members of the thesis committee consisting of **Dr. Susana C. Bautista**, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, **Dr. Merlita Castro, Dr. Marilou C. Urbina, Dr. Diosmar O. Fernandez** and **Dr. Pedrito Jose V. Bermudo,** for their valuable comments and suggestions which contributed immensely to this study. Likewise, to **Dr. Nonet A. Cuy** for her assistance on the data analysis.

To all the respondents who participated in this study, more particularly the students from **Dr. Filemon C. Aguilar Memorial College** and **Parañaque City College.**

To **Dr. Jacqueline P. Austria**, the researcher would like to express her gratitude for the guidance she gave throughout the entire process.

To **Ms. Maria Cristina S. Labao, Ms. Mary Grace M. Burgos,** and **Mr. Jerry N. Gayon**, whom she regards as her supervisors, she conveys many thanks for being patient and supportive especially when it was needed most while completing this research study.

To her batchmates from **MLIS**, specifically to **Section B,** the researcher gives special thanks because of their camaraderie and unexpected friendship despite distance, which made the experience truly meaningful. Congratulations to all of us!

To her **family members,** who have been not only morally but also materially supportive in her endeavor as a graduate student.

In gratitude to **Almighty God,** who provided for all her needs, the researcher thanks Him for His provision.

REFERENCES

1. Almeida, N., Macedo, M.& Souza, M. (2023). Práticas de learning commons. *Anais do XII Congresso Internacional de Conhecimento e Inovação (ciKi)*, 1(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368557055_PRATICAS_DE_LEARNING_COMMON
2. Aslam, M. (2021). Adapting to change in academic libraries. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 71 (8-9): 672–685. https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-04-2020-0053
3. Balicat, J. (2025). Library Services Utilization: Evaluating Availement for Optimal Efficiency. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR),* 7(3).https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/3/44307.pdf
4. Beneyat-Dulagan, M., & Cabonero, D. (2023). Exploring library activities, learning spaces, an challenges encountered towards the establishment of a learning commons. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 18(1), 3–23. https://journals.library.ualberta.ca/eblip index.php/EBLIP/article/view/30164
5. Biray, E. T., & Santos, Jr., F. G. D. (2025). Strategic direction of a local government unit-funded college in the Philippines. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 6(2), 500-512. https://www.ijmaberjournal.org/index.php/ijmaber/ article/view/2195? articlesBySimilarity Page=2
6. Catchuela, L. & De Jesus, D. (2026). Status of Selected Local Universities and Colleges in Metro Manila: Basis for Proposed Intervention Measures. *ShodhGyan-NU: Journal of Literature and Culture Studies,* 4(1). https://dx.doi.org/10.29121/Shodhgyan.v4.i1.2026.80
7. Chaddha, K. & Kanjilal, U. (2022). Transforming academic libraries into information commons: a proposed model. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 17(1), 5–37. https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip30004
8. Corrall, S. (2022). The Social Future of Academic Libraries: New Perspectives on Communities, Networks, and Engagement. (pp.109-147) Facet Publishing. https://doi.org/10.29085/9781783304738.007
9. Cruz, K. Q., & Barsaga, A. S. (2020). Exploring students' use of informal learning spaces in an academic library. *PAARL Research Journal, 7*, 55-74. Retrieved from https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/faculty_research/13333
10. Curry, R. (2022). Insights from a cultural-historical HE library makerspace case study on the potential for academic libraries to lead on supporting ethical-makingunderpinned by "critical material literacy." *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *55*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006221104796
11. DeFrain, E. & Hong, M. (2020). Interiors, affect, and use: How does an academic library's learning commons support students' needs? *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*. https://doi.org/10.18438/eblip29677
12. DeFrain, E., Thoegersen, J., & Hong, M. (2022). Standing out or blending in: academic libraries in the crowded informal learning space ecosystem. *College & Research Libraries*, 83(1). https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.83.1.45
13. Depano–Panganiban, C. P. (2023). Designing learning commons in academic libraries. *PAARL Research Journal, 9(1 - Special Anniversary Issue)*, 127-149. https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=20043

14. Dery, Z. M., Abrigo, C. M., & Torres, E. M., Jr. (2025). Revisiting the learning commons: an analysis of concepts and themes. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 1–22. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13614533.2025.2466528?af=R
15. Dianing, A., & Acedera, P. (2025.). Library Design and Academic Performance: Implications on Students' Engagement. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i5-33
16. Dobrovolska, V., Cherednyk, L., & Hunchenko, Y. (2022). Modern library as a socio-cultural space *International Workshop on Social Communication andInformation Activity in Digital Humanities.* Retrieved from https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3296/paper7.pdf
17. Flores, R., & Valerio, M. (2021). Library space design framework: a conceptual analysis. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 21(2). Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/49887954/Library_Space_Design_Framework_A_Conceptual_Analysis
18. Hamad, F., Maha Al-Fadel, & Fakhouri, H. N. (2022). The provision of smart service at academic libraries and associated challenges. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science,* 55(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006221114173
19. Jain, M. (2023). Learning commons (designing library space): a comprehensive working model for academic libraries. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research*, 5(2), 38–42. https://doi.org/10.33545/26649845. 2023.v5.i2a.59
20. Khan, M. K. (2024). User's perceptions and expectations with H.U Beg library services: a study of service quality measurement. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 8109. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/8109
21. Khan, A. U., Zhang, Z., Chohan, S. R., & Rafique, W. (2021). Factors fostering the success of IoT services in academic libraries: a study built to enhance the library performance. *Library HiTech*, 40 (6): 1976–1995. https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-06-2021-0179
22. Kim, Y., & Yang, E. (2022). Academic library spaces and student activities during the COVID-pandemic. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 48(4), 102529.https://doi.org/10.1016/j. acalib.2022.102529
23. Koh, J. H. L., & Kan, R. Y. P. (2020). Students' use of learning management systems and desired e-learning experiences: are they ready for next generation digital learning environments? Higher Education Research & Development, 40(5), 995–1010. https://doi.org /10.1080/07294360.2020.1799949
24. LaFleur, L. J. (2020). The collaborative commons: collaboration and leadership in the academic library learning commons. Proquest LLC. https://eric.ed. gov/?q=LEARNING+COMMONS+ MODEL&id=ED619145
25. Lakshmi, V.Y. & Majid, I. (2025). How ready are higher education students for e-learning? insights from Jammu & Kashmir. National Journal of Education, XXIII (2), 241-261. https://ssrn.com/abstract=5346351
26. Laspinas, M., Tan, J., & Dee, H. (2023). Collection assessment vis-à-vis CHED minimum standard. ResearchGate, 2(2), 3–6.
27. Leijon, M., Nordmo, I., Tieva, Å., & Troelsen, R. (2022). Formal learning spaces in higher education – a systematic review. Teaching in Higher Education, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2066469

28. Leung, T. N., Chiu, D. K., Ho, K. K., & Luk, C. K. (2021). User perceptions, academic library usage and social capital: a correlation analysis under COVID-19 after library renovation. Library Hi Tech. 40 (2): 304–322. https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-04-2021-0122
29. Li, K.C & five others. (2023). Evaluation of hybrid learning and teaching practices: the perspective of academics. Sustainability. (8), 6780; https://doi.org/10.3390/su15086780
30. Mabry, H. (2025). Level Up Your Library Space: Creating Modern Flexible Learning Spaces in a Small Academic Library. Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy, 3. https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gaintlit/2025/2025/3
31. Mangrum, S., & Foster, H. A. (2020). Student and staff perceptions of university library usage: comparing reality to interpretation of space usage. Journal of Access Services, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15367967.2020.1747025
32. Navarro, M. & four others. (2023). Knowledge, preparedness and challenges in hyflex library operations among higher education institutions (HEIs) librarians in Calabarzon Philippines. University Library at a New Stage of Social Communications Development Conference Proceedings, 38-52.
33. ODonnell, P., & Anderson, L. (2021). The university library: places for possibility. New Review of Academic Librarianship, 28(3), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2021.1906 718
34. Ojobor, R. (2024). The New Normal and Academic Libraries: Challenges and Prospects. International Journal of Knowledge Dissemination, 5(1), 66–76. https://doi.org/10.70118/ijkd.0202405010.7
35. Patrick, I. O and Oyovwe-Tinuoye, G. O. (2020). Users' perception of services, resources and facilities in Federal University of Petroleum Resources Effurun (FUPRE) Library. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal), 3654. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/3654
36. Peng, L., Jin, S., Deng, Y., & Gong, Y. (2022). Students' perceptions of active learning classrooms from an informal learning perspective: building a full-time sustainable learning environment in higher education. Sustainability, 14(14), 8578. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148578
37. Riratanaphong, C. (2024). Assessing Users' Demand for Library Space: Insights from an Architecture School. Journal of Architectural/Planning Research and Studies (JARS), 21(2), 361–386. https://doi.org/10.56261/jars.v21.267601
38. Roucaud, V. (2024). Building a maker culture in a library learning commons. Canadian School Libraries Journal. 8(1). https:// journal.canadianschoollibraries.ca/building-a-maker-culture-in-a-library-learning-commons/
39. Sabroso, J.V. (2025). Understanding library users' needs and preferences of understanding library users' needs and preferences of selected state universities and colleges in national capital region: basis for designing learning commons. Visionary Research Digest, 1(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395697557_Understanding_Library_Users'_Needs_and_Preferences_of_Understanding_Library_Users'_Needs_and_Preferences_of_Selected_State_Universities_and_Colleges_in_National_Capital_Region_Basis_For_Designing_Lear
40. Sahli, F., Alidousti, S., & Naghshineh, N. (2022). Branding in libraries: Identifying key requirements and dimensions to provide a conceptual model. Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 55(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006211056650
41. Samo, S. J. & Agcito, M. (2024). Library support: implications on student well-being. British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0448

42. Sharma, G., Kadambari, S, P., & Tripathi, R. (2025). The future of academic libraries: AI and adaptive learning platforms in a post-pandemic world. European Economic Letters, 15(2), 3269–3274. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v15i2.3165
43. Sun, X., Orillo, J. C., & Quinto, J. D. (2025). Utilization of learning commons in university libraries: basis for an innovative library feature enhancement plan. The International Information & Library Review, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2025.2475409
44. Thakor, D.S. (2023). Users' awareness, usage and attitude towards academic library resources and services. International Journal of Research in Library Science 9(4):66-77. https://doi.org/10.26761/ijrls.9.4.2023.1706
45. Tsang, A. L. Y., & Chiu, D. K. W. (2022). Effectiveness of virtual reference services in academic libraries: A qualitative study based on the 5E learning model. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 48(4), Article102533. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102533
46. Tokuwaki, Y., Kamide, T., Hirakawa, S., Maruyama, J., & Hiyama, K. (2024). Operational performance and environmental satisfaction survey of a university building with large learning commons. Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13467581.2024.2333464
47. Ubat, J., & Academia, E. (2025). Designing library spaces based on college students' reading and usage habits. Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0597
48. Utami, N.P (2023). Learning commons: upaya perpustakaan undiksha menciptakan lingkungan belajar bagi pemustaka generasi digital. Media Sains Informasi dan Perpustakaan, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.23887/msip.v3i1.2349
49. Yau, O. K., Chin, D. C., & Hsu, C. H. (2023). Understanding and planning for informal learning space development: A case study in Hong Kong. Cogent Education, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2180863
50. Villaflores, S. L. (2025, October 9). Library Learning Commons Empowers students through 2025 Information Marathon. Southern Leyte State University. https://www.southernleytestateu.edu.ph/index.php/en/menu-page-home/3465-library-learning-commons-empowers-students-through-2025-information-marathon.
51. Williams, M., Saunderson, I., & Dhoest, A. (2022). Library as place: evaluating physical and virtual spaces. a case study of two academic libraries. Mousaion: South African Journal of Information Studies, 39(3). https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-659x/8419
52. Zhou, J., Lam, E., Au, C., Lo, P., & Chiu, D. K. (2021). Library café or elsewhere: usage of study space by different majors under contemporary technological environment. Library Hi Tech, 40 (6): 1567–1581. https://doi.org/10.1108/lht-03-2021-0103