

Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of a State University in Negros Island Region

Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ¹ and Marianito Villaruz III²

¹Instructor I, Faculty of Criminal Justice Education, Siquijor State College, North Poblacion, Larena, Siquijor, Philippines

²Staff, Student Affairs Services, Bago City College, Bago City, Negros Occidental

Received: 26/08/2025

Revised: 04/09/2025

Accepted: 27/09/2025

Published: 10/10/2025

Abstract— The aim of this descriptive quantitative research is to gain insights from criminology students how campus security services impacts their safety in the campus. The respondents were Bachelor of Science in Criminology Students from a State University and will be chosen through stratified random sampling. An adapted instrument from Syaznida O., Normal R., Azlini C., Lukman, ZM., Kamal, M.Y. (2018) measured the extent of campus services while the survey questionnaire of Pascu (2018) was used to measure the degree to which the university implements safety measures. The result showed that as to demographic profile, the respondents were predominantly males, above 20 years old, almost equally distributed among year levels and are residing in their own homes. As to perceived extent of implementation of campus security services, the males have slightly mean scores compare to that of the females. As to age, those below 20 years old have similar mean scores to that of the 20 years old and above this signifies extensively implemented campus services. Those who resides in their own home and staying at relative, boarding house have indicated high extent implementation of campus security services. The results showed that when grouped as to aforementioned variables, as to sex, the male respondents perceived a very high level of the implementation of safety and security level while the females have not so high-level perception. As to age, both the younger and older respondents have very high level of perception as of the safety and security measures. In terms of year level, the implication that the university is taking extra precautions to maintain the security of their constituents was perceived by the students in all year levels. The result yields that there is no significant difference between the demographic variables age and resident status. However, a significant difference was deemed between the extent of implementation of campus security and demographic sex and year level. A significant difference resulted when Criminology students were surveyed as to how the implementation of safety and security measures and what resulted was that from among the demographic variable, sex and year level showed significance of difference while the null hypothesis was accepted in the demographics age and resident status.

Keywords: Campus Security, Implementation, Maintainance.



© 2025 by the authors; license Advances in Consumer Research. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY-NC-ND) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

According to Security Tx (2021), ensuring school security remained a primary concern, as it involved the safety of students, staff, and all individuals within the campus. Consequently, the role of a school security guard was demanding and came with significant challenges (Shpeizer, 2021). Guards had to remain vigilant at all times, even beyond school hours. Regardless of who was responsible for security, personnel needed to undergo proper training and be prepared to use physical force if necessary. Additionally, security officers had to handle pressure effectively and maintain composure, especially when interacting with children.

A report analyzing contemporary challenges and approaches in security systems differentiated between reactive and proactive security measures. Reactive security addressed vulnerabilities as they were being exploited, whereas proactive security sought to eliminate these vulnerabilities before they could be used (Huth & Nielson, 2019).

In the Philippines, schools generally followed standard security protocols, including the requirement for students to wear identification cards (IDs) at all times, visitor registration at entry points, and vehicle sticker policies for campus access. However, security incidents still occurred across campuses nationwide. Stabbing and shooting incidents, hazing, and bullying within school grounds heightened concerns over campus safety. These

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012.

alarming events prompted institutions to reassess their security measures thoroughly to prevent criticism from both public and private stakeholders. Moreover, security was not treated as a temporary fix; it was not merely a short-term solution requiring repeated application. Instead, the development of a comprehensive school security plan needed to be fully integrated into the daily operations of the institution (De Guzman, 2013, as cited in Mabanglao, 2020).

A local study by Lactuan and Catalbas (2024) examined the experiences of school security guards amid the "new normal" following the global pandemic. As educational institutions adapted to the evolving challenges of this period, the role of security personnel became even more critical in ensuring a safe environment for students, staff, and visitors. The study highlighted that school security guards demonstrated exceptional resilience and adaptability in fulfilling their expanded duties, including the implementation of health and safety protocols. The findings further emphasized the importance of creating a supportive and inclusive atmosphere that prioritized the well-being of both security personnel and the school community.

The legal framework governing safety and security measures in schools was based on the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (R.A. 10121) and Section 28 of CHED Memorandum Order No. 09, Series of 2013. These regulations mandated the provision of a safe, accessible, and secure environment, adherence to government standards for facilities, and the employment of trained and licensed security personnel. Additionally, disaster risk reduction and management initiatives, including accommodations for persons with disabilities, were essential components. Regular earthquake and fire drills, contingency planning, and mechanisms for student participation in crime prevention efforts were also required. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) issued directives (CMO-No. 09-s2013, Section 28) to higher education institutions (HEIs) to ensure campus security by enforcing compliance with safety standards, conducting disaster preparedness drills, and involving students in security initiatives.

Several studies examined stakeholders' perceptions of campus security. Puckett (2022) expanded this research by exploring how campus safety influenced enrollment decisions, assessing students' fear of crime, and evaluating perceptions of public safety officers and security policies. Meanwhile, Alender (2020) studied students' views on campus safety at a Florida university, revealing that students generally felt safe but preferred walking in groups. They suggested that security could be improved with additional lighting, emergency call stations, more physical security measures, and transportation assistance. Locally, Pascua (2018) examined the implementation of security measures at Cagayan State University-Piat campus, while Mabanglao (2020) assessed security practices at the Philippine College of Science and Technology.

However, a research gap existed in exploring criminology students' perspectives on the effectiveness of campus security services in a state college within the Negros Island Region.

This descriptive quantitative study aimed to understand how criminology students perceived the impact of campus security services on their safety. The expected outcome of the study was a proposed program for enhancing campus security services.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is grounded in Abraham Maslow's (1943, as cited in Alexander, 2020) hierarchy of needs theory. Maslow's perspective on education and learning suggests that individuals are driven to achieve when their fundamental needs are satisfied. Scholars have applied Maslow's framework to illustrate human motivation, which is influenced by physiological necessities, safety, a sense of belonging, self-esteem, and self-actualization. To help students reach their full potential within the campus environment, ensuring both emotional and physical security is essential. As a result, the need for safety is a relevant aspect of this research.

Additionally, the Routine Activity Theory serves as a crucial model for analyzing crime and understanding student perceptions of safety and security in higher education institutions. Originally developed by Cohen and Felson (1979, as cited in Tandiew & Thompo, 2020), this theory was formulated to account for the rise in predatory crime rates in the United States after World War II (Reyns, 2012; Tandiew & Thompo, 2020). The theory asserts that criminal victimization takes place when three key factors converge: the presence of a suitable target, a motivated offender, and the absence or ineffectiveness of a guardian to protect individuals or property (White, 2019).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Campus Safety and Security

Campus safety has become a significant concern for educational institutions across the United States. In the past, colleges and universities were seen as secure environments for students; however, this perception has changed over time (Miles, 2016, as cited in Alexander, 2020). Within these institutions, students have the freedom to move around as they wish (Wade, 2018, as cited in Alexander, 2020). Ensuring a safe campus is essential for faculty, students, and staff to effectively engage in academic activities (Hope, 2017). Despite this, there has been limited empirical research, both qualitative and quantitative, examining the sense of fear among university students (Boateng & Adjekum-Boateng, 2017, as cited in Alexander, 2020).

Students Perception of Campus Security

Several studies (Buhi, Clayton, & Surrency, 2009; Hollister et al., 2017; Sulkowski, 2011, as cited in Zachary et al., 2021) have examined the factors influencing students' decisions to report crimes on

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012.

university campuses. However, these studies have largely neglected to explore the extent to which students are aware of the proper procedures for reporting campus safety concerns to the appropriate authorities. We argue that disregarding students' awareness of crime reporting processes may lead to inaccurate conclusions regarding their reporting behavior. In other words, students may lack knowledge about how to report crimes, even if they are willing to do so.

Campus Security Services and Age

Puckett (2022) found that an analysis of significant differences revealed a consistent assessment of campus security policies across different demographic groups. This indicates a generally uniform perception, as there was no rejection of the null hypothesis, meaning no significant differences were observed. The results suggest that respondents provided answers based on either subjective or objective viewpoints, showcasing a variety of perspectives. The combined predictors accounted for 6% of the variance in safety and security satisfaction, with age being the only statistically significant variable ($\beta = 0.189$; $p < 0.001$). The positive coefficient indicates that older students tend to report higher satisfaction levels compared to their younger counterparts.

Additionally, Puckett (2022) highlighted that younger student are more likely to consider crime and safety as critical factors when selecting a college or university. One possible explanation is that older students, particularly non-traditional ones, may spend less time on campus, thereby perceiving a lower risk of victimization. Alternatively, older students might have different life experiences or a more comprehensive understanding of the risks associated with victimization.

Campus Security and Sex

Sullivan (2017, as cited in Alexander, 2020) suggests that female students generally experience a greater sense of victimization on college campuses compared to their male counterparts, particularly concerning campus security and the risk of physical harm. Additionally, women often adopt precautionary measures to safeguard themselves from stalking incidents (Sullivan, 2017). Research further indicates that at universities with at least 10,000 female students, the estimated number of rapes per year could reach 350 or more (Goldin et al., 2017, as cited in Alexander, 2020).

O'Malley (2019) found that students at this particular university generally felt safe on campus, especially in academic areas. Moreover, students were highly involved in campus activities and organizations. Factors influencing perceptions of safety included gender, university infrastructure, and past experiences with victimization. Many respondents in the study practiced precautionary behaviors, which contributed to their sense of security, particularly when participating in student and campus activities.

Braaten et al. (2022) identified significant relationships between gender, fear of crime, and satisfaction with campus security, all of which influenced students' perceptions of safety. Female students were less likely to perceive their campus as secure, while those who exhibited lower levels of fear and expressed greater satisfaction with security measures reported feeling safer overall.

To analyze the topic further, regression models were applied to determine how different factors influenced fear of crime, both on and off campus. Gender and age were found to be significant predictors of overall fear, with female and younger students reporting higher levels of concern. These findings align with prior research by Kaminski et al. (2010, as cited in Puckett, 2022), which highlighted those women, minorities, and younger students tend to experience heightened levels of fear. Specifically, female students expressed greater fear of crime victimization compared to their male peers (Puckett, 2022).

Campus Security and Resident Status

Puckett's (2022) study found that parents and guardians of students residing on campus were perceived to have greater concerns about crime and safety compared to those whose students lived off-campus. This may be due to the belief that on-campus students face a higher risk of victimization, as they are more exposed to potential offenders.

Although universities are generally expected to provide a secure environment, research suggests that individuals living and working on campuses still experience fear of crime (White, 2019). Paterson (2020) also highlighted in his study that concerns regarding campus and personal safety have risen over the past 10 to 15 years. Furthermore, an investigation into campus crime trends, the *Violent Victimization of University Students* study, revealed that the average annual rates of violent victimization among university students increased over seven years (Tandiwe & Thompo, 2020).

Safety and Security Measures

Programs designed to enhance campus safety and minimize physical harm play a crucial role in security measures. Rinaldi (2016, as cited in Alexander, 2020) introduced several initiatives that contribute to campus security efforts. Lessne, Cidade, Gerke, Roland, and Sinclair (2016, as cited in Alexander, 2020) reported a decline in secondary school violence; however, concerns about campus safety remain. Given the ongoing safety concerns at the university level, security-focused programs are necessary. Administrators have proposed measures such as metal detectors, surveillance cameras, and security policies to mitigate campus violence. However, limited research has been conducted on how these existing security measures influence students' perceptions (Lessne et al., 2016, as cited in Alexander, 2020).

Safety and Security Measures and Age

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012. The data indicates a positive correlation, suggesting that females were more likely than males to report higher levels of fear regarding off-campus crime. Additionally, the negative correlation with age implies that younger individuals tended to express greater fear of off-campus crime compared to older individuals (Puckett, 2022).

Furthermore, parents or guardians of younger students were perceived to place greater emphasis on crime and safety concerns than those of older students. This may be because older students often apply to college independently, without parental input, or due to a lack of communication that prevents them from fully understanding their parents' perspectives on the matter (Puckett, 2022).

Safety and Security Measures and Sex

Gender differences in campus victimization can help explain disparities in safety perceptions. In particular, incidents of sexual violence are a major concern, as they significantly influence how students perceive campus security (Jenning et al., 2007; Linder & Lacy, 2020). Linder and Lacy (2020) investigated this issue by examining the perspectives of college-aged females regarding campus safety and the factors shaping these views. A key finding from their research indicated that the fear of potential sexual violence had a greater impact on their perception of safety compared to other forms of victimization.

Bedera and Nordmeyer (2015, as cited in Puckett, 2022) discovered that the majority (approximately 80%) of campus security guidelines related to sexual violence prevention were specifically aimed at women. This emphasis suggests that female students are expected to be more concerned about their safety (Bedera & Nordmeyer, 2015, as cited in Puckett, 2022). These guidelines also highlighted alcohol as a contributing factor to sexual violence. Bedera and Nordmeyer (2015,

as cited in Puckett, 2022) argued that such messaging, particularly concerning alcohol, could perpetuate victim-blaming, especially in cases where the victim was intoxicated.

A statistical analysis identified two significant variables: gender ($\beta = 0.318$; $p < 0.001$) and age ($\beta = -0.317$; $p < 0.001$). The positive correlation for gender indicated that female students experienced a greater fear of crime compared to male students. Additionally, younger students reported higher overall fear levels than their older counterparts (Puckett, 2022).

The perception of crime and safety was also more pronounced among the parents or guardians of female students. Prior studies suggest that this may be linked to the heightened fear of crime among women (Kaminski et al., 2010; Tomsich et al., 2011). Consequently, parents or guardians may be more concerned about the safety of their daughters than their sons. Furthermore, media and academic discussions surrounding campus victimization have largely focused on sexual offenses (Day, 1994, as cited in Puckett, 2022). Since female students are at greater risk of such incidents, this may contribute to increased parental concern (Tomsich et al., 2011, as cited in Puckett, 2022).

Safety and Security Measures and Resident Status

Pukett (2022) notes that individuals living off-campus, particularly younger students, are more inclined to reside with parents, guardians, or other family members. This arrangement may reduce concerns about safety, as parents or guardians have a better ability to oversee their children's activities and whereabouts. However, additional research is required to understand the influence of crime and safety on the decision-making process for both students and their families, as there is limited prior research on this subject.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This quantitative study was a descriptive research design, which is the process of describing relationships without defining the cause (Vera et al., 2016 in Konsinki, 2024). Descriptive research aims to describe a chosen variable. Studies with this design provide information about a sample by describing the distribution of one or more variables, without attempting to determine causation (Aggarwal & Ranganathan, 2019 in Konsinki, 2024). This type of research design is specifically selected for this study due to this study's aim to understand the student's perception of campus security and safety and security measures undertaken by the university.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents in this study were students pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Criminology from a state university, selected using stratified random sampling. This method involves obtaining a random sample from each segment or group of the population separately. Stratification is beneficial when the population is homogeneous within each group but shows significant differences between groups, as it enhances the accuracy of statistical analysis. Additionally, stratification can simplify the administration of the selection process, allowing for delegation to field offices (Siegel and Wagner, 2022).

Table of Respondents

| Year Level | N | n |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| First Year | 356 | 122 |
| Second Year | 315 | 123 |
| Third Year | 345 | 125 |
| Fourth Year | 324 | 122 |

| | |
|-------|-----|
| Total | 491 |
|-------|-----|

Number of respondents reported is 492.

Research Instrument

- The research instrument was divided into three parts:
- This part included the demographic profile age, sex, and resident status.
- An adapted instrument from Syaznida O., Normala R., Azlini C., Lukman, Z.M., Kamal, M.Y. (2018) that measured the extent of campus security services.

Table of Survey Scale

| Scale | Mean Range | Verbal Response | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------|-------------|--------------------|---|
| 4 | 3.26 – 4.00 | Extensively | The campus security personnel perform their duty to the best of their ability |
| 3 | 2.51 – 3.25 | Great Extent | The campus personnel security is very notable in their performance |
| 2 | 1.76 – 2.50 | Not so extensively | The campus security personnel perform less effort |
| 1 | 1.00 – 1.75 | Limited extent | There is mediocrity in the way campus personnel performs |

III. The survey questionnaire of Pascua (2018) was used to measure the degree to which the university implements safety and security measures.

| Scale | Mean Range | Verbal Response | Verbal Interpretation |
|-------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| 4 | 3.26 – 4.00 | Very Adequate | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| 3 | 2.51 – 3.25 | Adequate | The security and security measures are in existence but there are areas which are deficient |
| 2 | 1.76 – 2.50 | Not so adequate | There are safety and security measures but are not sufficient |
| 1 | 1.00 – 1.75 | Deficient | The safety and security measure are non-existent |

Both instruments underwent reliability tests using Cronbach Alpha and validity testing by a panel of experts in Criminology and Campus security. The respondents who were not actual respondents were asked to be part of the pilot testing.

Data Analysis

The data that were gathered were subjected to appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Frequency counts, percentages, mean, standard deviation, Chi-Square Test for Independence, Mann-Whitney test, and Kruskal-Wallis's test were utilized.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Profile of the Respondents when Grouped According to Sex, Age, Year Level, and Resident Status

| Variables | f | % |
|------------------------|-----|------|
| Sex | | |
| Male | 257 | 52.2 |
| Female | 235 | 47.8 |
| Age | | |
| Below 20 years old | 196 | 39.8 |
| 20 years old and above | 296 | 60.2 |
| Year Level | | |

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012.

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----|------|
| | First year | 122 | 24.8 |
| | Second year | 123 | 25 |
| | Third year | 125 | 25.4 |
| | Fourth year | 122 | 24.8 |
| Resident Status | | | |
| | Own Home | 252 | 51.2 |
| | Staying at relatives | 87 | 17.7 |
| | Boarding House | 153 | 31.1 |
| As a whole | | 492 | 100 |

In terms of sex, there were more males (52.2%) than females (47.8%). Regarding age, younger respondents below 20 years old comprised 39.8% of the sample, while those aged 20 years and above made up the majority (60.2%).

The distribution across year levels showed nearly equal representation: first-year students accounted for 24.8%, second-year students for 25%, third-year students for 25.4%, and fourth-year students for 24.8%.

As for residency status, 51.2% of the respondents lived in their own homes, 17.7% stayed with relatives, and 31.1% resided in boarding houses.

Table 2. The Extent of Perceived Campus Security Services and Aforementioned Demographic Variables

| Variables | Group | n | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----|------|------|---|
| Sex | | | | | |
| | Male | 257 | 3.69 | 0.41 | There exists very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Female | 235 | 3.54 | 0.46 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Age | | | | | |
| | Below 20 years old | 196 | 3.62 | 0.45 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | 20 years old and above | 296 | 3.62 | 0.43 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Year Level | | | | | |
| | First year | 122 | 3.80 | 0.34 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Second year | 123 | 3.50 | 0.45 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Third year | 125 | 3.53 | 0.50 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Fourth year | 122 | 3.66 | 0.38 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Resident Status | | | | | |
| | Own Home | 252 | 3.62 | 0.42 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Staying at relatives | 87 | 3.62 | 0.46 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Boarding House | 153 | 3.63 | 0.45 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| As a whole | | 492 | 3.62 | 0.44 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |

Table 2 presents the extent of perceived campus security services when grouped according to the aforementioned variables.

The data collection indicated that campus security services were significantly implemented when analyzed by gender. Males exhibited slightly higher mean scores ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.41$) compared to females ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.46$). This suggests that both genders recognized the commitment of campus personnel in providing security services at the university and acknowledged their efforts to enhance students' sense of safety. According to Braaten et al. (2022), gender, crime-related fears, and satisfaction with campus security significantly influence students' perceptions of safety. Females tend to feel less secure on campus, while students who experience less fear of crime and express greater satisfaction with security measures report higher perceptions of safety.

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012. Regarding age, respondents under 20 years old (M=3.62, SD=0.45) had mean scores comparable to those aged 20 and above (M=3.62, SD=0.43), indicating that campus security services were widely implemented. Both younger and older respondents felt that campus security personnel performed their duties diligently, leading Criminology students to believe that their safety was adequately prioritized.

The study also revealed slight variations in mean scores across different year levels: first-year (M=3.80, SD=0.34), second-year (M=3.50, SD=0.45), third-year (M=3.53, SD=0.50), and fourth-year (M=3.66, SD=0.38). However, all year levels perceived campus security services as comprehensively implemented, suggesting that the university took additional measures to ensure student safety. Tshivhase and Mdlungu (2020) found that criminal justice majors reported lower levels of concern and were less affected by crime-related incidents compared to students in other disciplines (del Carmen et al., 2000, as cited in Puckett, 2022). Similarly, Wu (2010, as cited in Puckett, 2022) explored how academic majors influenced perceptions of campus police and crime fears, revealing that criminal justice majors generally had more favorable views of police and lower levels of fear regarding crime victimization.

Responses related to residential status showed similar trends. Students living in their own homes (M=3.62, SD=0.42), with relatives (M=3.63, SD=0.46), or in boarding houses (M=3.63, SD=0.45) reported a high extent of campus security service implementation. Those residing in their own homes may have perceived campus security services more positively, feeling more confident about their safety both on and off campus. While universities are generally expected to be safe and crime-free, studies indicate that individuals living and working on campuses often express concerns about crime (White, 2019). Paterson (2020) noted a rise in safety concerns over the past 10 to 15 years.

Contrasting findings exist in earlier studies regarding campus security implementation. Pascua (2018) suggested that the campus security system was not fully operational. The findings of this study indicated that respondents viewed the university's security system as only moderately implemented, suggesting partial compliance with safety requirements. Respondents highlighted several shortcomings in security implementation, including the failure of security personnel to adhere to established protocols and a lack of vigilance in protecting university property and the campus community.

Overall, Criminology students perceived that campus security services were implemented to a high extent.

Table 3. The Level of Safety and Security Measures When Grouped According to The Aforementioned Variables

| Variables | | Mean | SD | Interpretation |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|------|--|
| Sex | Male | 3.51 | 0.47 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Female | 3.32 | 0.57 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Age | Below 20 years old | 3.43 | 0.48 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | 20 years old and above | 3.41 | 0.56 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Year Level | First year | 3.59 | 0.39 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Second year | 3.31 | 0.51 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Third year | 3.29 | 0.63 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Fourth year | 3.47 | 0.50 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| Resident Status | Own Home | 3.43 | 0.52 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Staying at relatives | 3.39 | 0.58 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| | Boarding House | 3.40 | 0.52 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |
| As a whole | | 3.42 | 0.53 | There exist very sufficient safety and security measure. |

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012. Table 3 presents the level of safety and security measures observed on campus. The findings indicate that when analyzed based on the specified variables, male respondents reported a significantly higher perception of campus safety and security measures compared to their female counterparts. Male Criminology students had a mean score of 3.69 (SD = 0.41), suggesting that they felt more secure and believed that safety protocols were effectively implemented. In contrast, female students appeared to experience greater anxiety regarding their safety on campus. This suggests that male respondents may have greater confidence in their ability to protect themselves, regardless of the safety measures in place, compared to female respondents.

Gender differences in perceptions of safety may be attributed to common victimization experiences in campus environments. Sexual violence is a major concern that significantly influences feelings of safety (Jennings et al., 2007; Linder & Lacy, 2020). Research by Linder and Lacy (2020) examined how college-aged females perceive campus safety and the factors influencing those perceptions, revealing that fears related to sexual violence had a greater impact on their sense of security than other forms of victimization. Bedera and Nordmeyer (2015, as cited in Puckett, 2022) noted that campus safety messages primarily targeted female students (around 80% of the messaging), implying that they should be more vigilant about their safety. These resources often highlighted alcohol as a contributing factor to sexual violence, which Bedera and Nordmeyer argued perpetuated victim-blaming narratives, particularly when victims were intoxicated.

Regarding age, both younger and older respondents demonstrated high perceptions of safety and security measures, suggesting that both groups believed campus safety protocols were effective. Regardless of age, the data indicated that female students were more likely to report higher levels of fear regarding crime occurring off-campus than male students. Additionally, younger respondents exhibited greater fear of off-campus crime compared to their older peers (Puckett, 2022). Parents or guardians of younger students were also perceived as prioritizing crime and safety more than those of older students, potentially because older students had greater independence in college applications or because younger students had less communication with their families on these issues (Puckett, 2022).

When analyzed by year level, first- and fourth-year Criminology students rated safety measures highly, while second- and third-year students expressed lower perceptions. This may suggest that newcomers to campus have higher expectations regarding safety, as they have yet to encounter significant challenges. In contrast, senior students may have developed coping strategies for potential safety threats. The lower perceptions among second- and third-year students could reflect negative experiences related to safety or security. Notably, Criminology students generally felt safer in their homes than in boarding houses or when staying with relatives.

Overall, the implementation of safety and security measures was perceived positively across demographic groups. A survey conducted by Sulkowski (2011, as cited in Christo, Jensen, and Oyinlade, 2021) with 967 undergraduate students at a large university in the southern U.S. explored factors influencing students' willingness to report safety threats. Results showed that approximately 70% of students were at least somewhat willing to report threats to campus authorities. Sulkowski found that trust in the college support system, campus connectedness, and self-efficacy were positively correlated with students' willingness to report safety threats, while delinquency negatively affected this willingness. No significant relationships were noted between reporting willingness and demographic factors such as gender, race/ethnicity, class status, or residence.

Table 4. Significant Difference as To the Extent of Perceived Campus Security Services When Grouped According to The Aforementioned Variables

| Variables | Group | Mean | p-value | Interpretation |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|---------|-----------------|
| Sex | Male | 3.69 | 0.00 | Significant |
| | Female | 3.54 | | |
| Age | Below 20 years old | 3.62 | 0.91 | Not Significant |
| | 20 years old and above | 3.62 | | |
| Year Level | First year | 3.80 | 0.00 | Significant |
| | Second year | 3.50 | | |
| | Third year | 3.53 | | |
| | Fourth year | 3.66 | | |
| Resident Status | Own Home | 3.62 | 0.95 | Not Significant |
| | Staying at relatives | 3.62 | | |

Table 4 presents the findings on the significant differences in the implementation of campus security based on demographic variables such as sex, age, year level, and resident status. The analysis reveals no significant differences concerning age ($p = 0.91$) and resident status ($p = 0.95$). However, significant differences were found about sex ($p = 0.00$) and year level ($p = 0.00$). These results suggest that female students may have less confidence in the implementation of campus security compared to their male counterparts. Additionally, students in higher year levels appear to be more accustomed to campus security protocols, while first-year students may hold a more favorable view of security measures as they are still acclimating to the school environment.

The research by Tejano (2023) aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment of campus security policies among higher education institutions (HEIs), identifying key demographic variables such as age, sex, civil status, educational background, and training. The majority of respondents were students, emphasizing the need to address their concerns. The analysis showed that perceptions of campus security policies were consistent across different demographic groups, supporting the null hypothesis of no significant differences.

Additionally, the study by Tshivhase and Mdlungu (2020) identified significant disparities in the assessments of campus security implementation among teaching personnel, staff, and security personnel, particularly regarding personnel security.

Table 5. Significant Difference in The Level of Safety and Security Measures when Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

| Variables | | Mean | p-value | Interpretation |
|-----------------|------------------------|------|---------|-----------------|
| Sex | Male | 3.51 | 0.00 | Significant |
| | Female | 3.32 | | |
| Age | Below 20 years old | 3.43 | 0.59 | Not Significant |
| | 20 years old and above | 3.41 | | |
| Year Level | First year | 3.59 | 0.00 | Significant |
| | Second year | 3.31 | | |
| | Third year | 3.29 | | |
| | Fourth year | 3.47 | | |
| Resident Status | Own Home | 3.43 | 0.78 | Not Significant |
| | Staying at relatives | 3.39 | | |
| | Boarding House | 3.40 | | |

Table 5 presents the significant differences in the level of safety and security measures when grouped according to the aforementioned variables. A survey conducted among Criminology students revealed notable differences in the implementation of safety and security measures based on demographic factors. Specifically, significant differences were found concerning sex ($p = 0.00$) and year level ($p = 0.00$), while the null hypothesis was accepted for age ($p = 0.59$) and resident status ($p = 0.78$). The data indicated that female students were more likely to report heightened levels of fear regarding crime off-campus compared to their male counterparts. Additionally, a negative correlation with age suggested that younger individuals expressed greater concerns about off-campus crime than older individuals (Puckett, 2022).

The null hypothesis was tested and rejected, leading to the acceptance of the research hypothesis, which posited a significant difference in the perceived effectiveness of campus security measures across three major areas at PhilCST. This suggests that administrators, faculty, non-teaching staff, students, and visitors hold varying perceptions of which campus security measures are most and least likely to be implemented. Mabanglo's (2020) study highlighted these differences, emphasizing that respondents' familiarity with campus security measures may influence their comfort levels regarding safety (Ngo et al., 2014, in Mabanglo, 2020).

Regarding year level, the null hypothesis was rejected due to significant differences found. The study explored whether the colleges attended by students affected their awareness of campus safety services. The rationale was that the types of degree programs offered and proximity to the campus safety department could impact this awareness. For instance, the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, which is part of the College of Public Affairs and Community Service, focuses on campus safety issues, leading to the assumption that students interested in criminal justice might be more

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012. aware of safety services. Conversely, it was presumed that students in the College of Arts and Sciences, located near the Department of Campus Safety, would have greater awareness than those in the College of Business, which is further away. However, the results did not support this assumption, indicating that exposure to campus safety information was similar across all colleges (Christo, Jensen, and Oyinlade, 2021).

Regarding resident status, no significant differences were found among students living on campus, in boarding houses, or with relatives, as safety and security were perceived to be well implemented in all cases. Puckett (2020) noted that off-campus residents, particularly younger students, often live with parents or guardians, which may lead to a reduced concern for safety due to increased parental supervision. Consequently, further research is necessary to explore the influence of crime and safety on college or university choice, as limited literature exists on this topic.

Table 6. Significant Relationship in the Level of Safety and Security Measures when Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

| Variables | r | p-value | Interpretation |
|--|-------|---------|----------------|
| Extent of perceived campus security services | 0.565 | 0.00 | Significant |
| Level of safety and security measures | | | |

Table 6 presents the significant relationship in the level of safety and security measures when grouped according to the aforementioned variables.

The findings indicate a weak but significant correlation ($p = 0.00$) between the extent of perceived campus security services and the level of safety measures. This suggests that when campus security protocols are effectively implemented, stakeholders, including students, perceive the school as a safe environment, fostering a greater sense of security while studying.

A study conducted by Patalinbug et al. (2023) revealed that crime prevention strategies implemented in the community are noticeable, and public awareness of these measures is significant. In terms of safety and security, respondents generally considered the province to be safe and rated it as moderately safe when personal belongings were left unattended. The likelihood of threats to physical safety and property security was perceived to be low. Additionally, the study found a statistically significant but weak positive correlation between crime prevention efforts and perceptions of safety and security. Furthermore, there was a notable weak positive correlation between perceptions of safety and security and overall satisfaction with personal safety among the sampled respondents.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Summary of Results

The results showed that, in terms of demographic profile, the respondents were predominantly male, above 20 years old, almost equally distributed across year levels, and primarily residing in their own homes.

Regarding the perceived extent of campus security service implementation, male respondents had slightly higher mean scores compared to female respondents. In terms of age, those below 20 years old had similar mean scores to those aged 20 and above, indicating that campus security services were perceived as extensively implemented. Additionally, students residing in their own homes, as well as those staying with relatives or in boarding houses, reported a high extent of campus security service implementation.

When grouped according to the aforementioned variables, male respondents perceived a very high level of implementation of safety and security measures, while female respondents had a slightly lower perception. In terms of age, both younger and older respondents reported a very high level of perception regarding safety and security measures. Across all year levels, students recognized that the university was

taking extra precautions to maintain the security of its constituents.

The results indicated no significant differences in the extent of campus security implementation based on age and resident status. However, significant differences were found concerning sex and year level.

When Criminology students were surveyed on the implementation of safety and security measures, the analysis revealed significant differences based on sex and year level, while no significant differences were found based on age and resident status, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis for these variables.

Additionally, a weak but significant correlation ($p = 0.00$) was found between the perceived extent of campus security services and the level of safety measures.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicated that campus security played a crucial role in shaping students' perceptions of their safety and security on campus. Factors such as gender, age, year level, and residency status significantly influenced students' concerns regarding safety and security. These variables varied considerably among the

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012.

selected Criminology students, making it challenging to generalize the results to other institutions. However, this variation allowed for the potential application of the study's findings in other contexts facing similar challenges. Additionally, notable differences in perceptions regarding the enforcement of campus security measures and overall safety conditions were observed across various demographic groups within the state university.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study was restricted to Criminology students at a state university located in the Negros Island region. Perceptions were inherently subjective and varied significantly among individuals. It was observed that students had diverse experiences and viewpoints regarding campus safety and security, influenced by their interactions and situations. Additionally, limitations related to the sample size and its representativeness were acknowledged. Furthermore, new policies, initiatives, or events may have emerged since the study was conducted, potentially affecting students' perceptions.

Direction for Future Research

Gathering the perspectives of all students was challenging due to the limited scope of respondents, as the study focused solely on one campus and one program. The study could have benefited from a more comprehensive approach by incorporating additional programs beyond the Criminology department. Additionally, including responses from other stakeholders, such as administration, faculty, and staff, could have provided a more well-rounded view. To further improve the findings, employing multiple methods, including qualitative approaches, would have been advantageous.

REFERENCES

- Puckett, Kaitlyn, "Safety and Security On Campus: Student Perceptions and Influence on Enrollment" (2022). Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 4103. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/4103>
- Barte, B. C., Joshel L. Catugal, Clifford A. Largo, Le Brixs J. Paglinawan, Teopisto Y. Culanag Jr. & Jose F. Cuevas Jr (2022). Level of Preparedness of the School Security Personnel and Their Qualifications Towards Institutional Security. *Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences (MJBAS)* Volume 6, Issue 2, Pages 85-102, April-June 2022
- Hignite, L. R., Marshall, S., & Naumann, L. (2018). The Ivory Tower Meets the Inner City: Student Protective and Avoidance Behaviors on an Urban University Campus. *College Student Journal*, 118-138.
- Allen, A. (2021). Are Campus Police 'Real' Police? Students' Perception of Campus Versus Municipal Police. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice, and Principles*, 102-121.
- Puckett, Kaitlyn, "Safety and Security on Campus: Student Perceptions and Influence on Enrollment" (2022). Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 4103. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/4103>
- Morrison, S. (2021). Students' Perception of Campus Safety and Security at Accra Technical University, Ghana. *The International Journal of Humanities & Social Studies* Vol 9 Issue 4
- Roberts, Nicola (2022) The dark and desolate campus: what can be done to enhance students' perceptions of safety on-campus? *Safer Communities*, 21 (3). pp. 157-170. ISSN 1757-8043
- Mabanglo, J.K (2020). Campus Security Practices" Assessment of Philippine College of Science and Technology. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publication* Volume 4 Issue 4 April 2020
- Alexander, D. L (2020), "Understanding Students' Perceptions of Campus Safety at a Florida University" (2020). *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*. 9688. <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertation/s/9688>
- Ayeo-ee, S. (2023). The Competency of Security Guards in The Performance of Their Responsibilities. *PRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal* Volume: 9| Issue: 5| May 2023| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2023: 8.224 || ISI Value: 1.188
- Tejano, Assessment on the campus security policies among higher education institution (HEIs) in the city of koronadal, south cotabato. *International Journal of Research Publication*. 2023, 139(1), 116-136; doi: 10.47119/IJRP10013911220235798
- Tshako, J.J. (2024). Faculty Of Color Experiences with Their Community College Campus Police. *California State University, Long Beach ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*, 2024. 31299595.
- Wade, K. (2023). We Shall Overcome: A Narrative Inquiry of How Recent Trio Student Support Services (SSS) Graduates Overcame Barriers to Achieve Academic Success at a Rural Community College. *Morgan State University ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*, 2023. 30313425.
- Godfrey, B. (2023). An Analysis of Crime and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design on a University Campus. *University of Louisiana at Lafayette ProQuest Dissertations & Theses*, 2023. 30575277.
- Sasitha, M.A., Shanmugapriya, S. and Anagha S. (2023). A study on challenges faced by security guards working for different establishments in teynampet Chennai. *International Journal of Applied Research*. DOI:

How to cite: Jimmy C. Encabo, MSCJ and Marianito Villaruz III. Students' Perception of Campus Security Personnel and Safety and Security Measures of A State University in Negros Island Region. *Adv Consum Res.* 2025;2(4):5001–5012.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.22271/allresearch.2023.v9.i11d.11387>

16. Jovanović J, Šarac I, Martačić JD, Oggiano GP, Despotović M, Pokimica B, et al. The influence of specific aspects of occupational stress on security guards' health and work ability: detailed extension of a previous study. *Archives of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology.* 2020;71(4):359-374. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/aiht-2020-71-3379>.
17. Catalbas, V. B. and Lactuan, A. (2024). Experiences Of Security Guards Serving In Diocesan Schools During The Covid-19 Pandemic: A Case Study. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research* Vol 2 No 1 January 2024 www.icceph.com
18. Zachary Christo, Anna Jensen, A. Olu Oyinlade, Awareness of Campus Safety Services Among Students in a Midwestern University in the United States, *International Journal of Applied Sociology*, Vol. 11 No. 2, 2021, pp. 33-45. doi: [10.5923/j.ijas.20211102.01](https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijas.20211102.01). <http://article.sapub.org/10.5923.j.ijas.20211102.01.html#Sec2.1>