



Level of satisfaction on the security services of a state university: Basis for continuous improvement

¹Jocelyn S. Gabata, ²John Marco J. Rarugal & ³Kristelle Ann R. Torres

Abstract

The study aimed to determine the level of satisfaction on the security services of a state University in the Philippines in terms of security personnel conduct, physical security, and protection of sensitive information. Likewise, the study aimed to establish the significant differences between assessment of the employees and students. The respondents of this research were 380 employees and 300 students for the Academic Year 2022-2023. The study utilized weighted mean, t-test analyze the data. Also, the study used the descriptive-comparative and cross-sectional method as research design. The content-validated and self-constructed questionnaire, which reported an acceptable reliability index of Cronbach $\alpha = 0.76$ was its tool in data gathering. Based on the analysis of the findings, the study found that both respondents possessed a high level of satisfaction on the security services across all the variables. Further, significant differences were found with regard to security personnel conduct and physical security. With this, courses of action were made for continuous improvement of the security services. Future researchers may consider the conduct of continuing evaluation to have a comprehensive understanding of its services to develop better improvement strategies.

Keywords: *physical security, protection of sensitive information, satisfaction, security personnel conduct, security services*

Article History:

Received: December 29, 2023

Accepted: April 17, 2024

Revised: February 20, 2024

Published online: June 15, 2024

Suggested Citation:

Gabata, J.S., Rarugal, J.M.J. & Torres, K.A.R. (2024). Level of satisfaction on the security services of a state university: Basis for continuous improvement. *The Research Probe*, 4(1), 101-123. <https://doi.org/10.53378/trp.0624.1.6.2>

About the authors:

¹Corresponding author. Bachelor of Science in Criminology (on-going). Laguna State Polytechnic University-Los Baños Campus. Student-researcher, College of Criminal Justice Education. Email: gabatajocelyn20@gmail.com

²Bachelor of Science in Criminology (on-going). Laguna State Polytechnic University-Los Baños Campus. Student-Researcher, College of Criminal Justice Education. johnmarcorarugal@gmail.com;

³Doctor of Philosophy in Criminal Justice. Laguna State Polytechnic University-Los Baños Campus. Associate Dean, College of Criminal Justice Education. Email: kristelleanntorres@gmail.com

© The author (s). Published by Institute of Industry and Academic Research Incorporated.



This is an open-access article published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license, which grants anyone to reproduce, redistribute and transform, commercially or non-commercially, with proper attribution. Read full license details here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Introduction

In a world where uncertainty and danger are apparent, the desire for security becomes a central concern of political thought and action. It seems to convey a broad need for increased dependability, stability, and tangibility when confronted with the gloomy forces of unpredictability, rapid change, and complexity. Ironically, though, there is no universally accepted definition of "security" itself. Instead, it delineates the limits of the fiercely competitive field. Any institution or organization needs discipline, security, and safety precautions. Authorities and administrators are committed in assisting its clientele in providing a safe working environment for all its population. Great campus discipline, safety and security measures reduce crimes and support the organization mission.

The school is where a students spend most of their time for the purpose of preparing their future through formal education. Universities have different strategies in providing the students with the most conducive learning environment as possible, free from physical violence or harm. The effectiveness of an educational institution strategy should not go beyond what is legal as learning institutions, students and their clientele deserve the protection that any educational institution could provide. As mandated by Senate Bill No. 1324 by Hon. Manuel Manny Villar, Jr. "An Act to Promote Crime Awareness and Security on Campuses" this bill empowers the state to gather precious data regarding the occurrence of crimes that happen to an educational institution (Section IV Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campuses Crime Statistics). Statistics concerning the occurrence on campus, during the most recent school year, and during the two preceding school years, are available, including, but not limited to the following criminal offenses reported to campus security authorities or local agencies: murder; rape; robbery; aggravated assault; sexual harassment; and motor vehicle theft (Senate Bill 1324). This Senate Bill proves to be useful because all data gathered here could be the future reference in the creation of new guidelines that will be beneficiary to the welfare and protection of the students and the improvement of the security services in all campuses.

Schools and universities are valuable institutions that help strengthen the nation's foundations and serve as a platform for future generations' progress and stability. As a result, one of the most troubling social issues in the country today is crime in schools and colleges. It has an impact not just on persons involved in the criminal incident, but also on societal

growth and stability. In this light, it is critical to comprehend the characteristics of crime in schools, colleges, and universities, as well as the offenders who allegedly commit these offenses, so that law enforcement, policymakers, school administrators, and the general public can effectively combat and reduce the amount of crime occurring at these institutions.

Security management encompasses a field of management related to asset management, physical security and human resource safety functions. It entails the identification of an organization's information assets and the development, documentation and implementation of policies, standards, procedures and guidelines. There are many important responsibilities that are being brought out in running a university. One of the most important is proper security management. Campus security is necessary in order to keep employees and their belongings safe.

It is critical to maintain the safety and security of the school environment, which includes the school buildings, grounds, labs, swimming pool, computer rooms, libraries, bathrooms, drinking water facilities, and adjacent areas. The structures should be designed to ensure "life safety" and to be more resistant to risks. School management, staff, instructors, and students all need to be more aware of and prepared to respond to any natural or man-made disaster. Schools must use low-cost, environmentally friendly technologies without sacrificing structural soundness or building safety.

The safety of students in schools is just as vital as their physical safety in order to achieve comprehensive student safety. Installing CCTV cameras in strategic areas throughout school grounds would ensure that a child's day-to-day activities at school are always observed and recorded. Schools must be on the lookout for any type of abuse, whether physical, emotional, or sexual. Staff should be taught to recognize major symptoms of abuse and be ready to respond to improper or harmful behavior immediately. Schools' policy formulation must adhere to the risk management paradigm of prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery (PPRR). In terms of kid safety, this strategy would assist school administration in remaining watchful. Security cameras can aid in school safety investigations and possibly serve as deterrents to such behavior.

Díaz-Vicario and Sallán (2017) cited that schools should be safe spaces for students, teaching staff and non-teaching staff. For the concept of "safety" to be meaningful, it must be interpreted broadly to encompass well-being in its widest sense. A common challenge for schools and educational authorities is, therefore, to manage school safety appropriately not

only to prevent physical accidents and incidents, but also with the purpose of creating an environment that promotes physical, emotional and social well-being, both individually and collectively. Grayson (2012) mentioned that the primary job of any security program is to prevent crime. Crime prevention is a good beginning, but great security demands more. It must also deal with perception the fear of crime. Security personnel conduct is also important on how the personnel deal with clients, perform their duties and shows behavior. It affects the feeling of security of students and employees entering the premises of the campus. Great security services reduce crime and support the organizational mission. When people feel safe and secure, learning improves, stress levels drop, sick days decrease while employee longevity increases.

In line with the aforementioned discussion, a safe university environment is linked to improved student and school outcomes. In particular, emotional and physical safety in the university was related to academic performance. Herewith, this study aimed to determine the level of satisfaction on the security services of a state university. Specifically, the study sought to gather the level of satisfaction of the students and employees on the security services. Findings from this study will have significant implications for the University for additional reference to improve the security services implemented.

2. Literature review

2.1. Safety and security inside the campus

Bassey (2009) defines security as measures put in place to ensure that things work well to one's advantage and which makes sure that nothing goes wrong with what affects one's personal or group interest in whatever way. Security can also be perceived as "an innovative, systematic and proactive process for the determination of danger and the protection of persons and property from harm of any kind, whether man-made or by nature". This implies firstly, that security network must be innovative, must involve some principles that are characterized by new ideas and devices that are germane to the dynamic nature of the society. Secondly, security is systematic in nature and constitutes interrelated body of ideas, methodical procedure and thoroughness. Finally, security is being perceived as preventive

because it should be able to anticipate and forestall in advance any form of harm or threat to life and property.

Jian and Rao (2011) associated security with provision against theft and entry of unauthorized persons, into work premises, and is essential for preventing sabotage. The duties of the security personnel in the University are multifaceted; hence they are engaged to work day and night. Security makes sure that buildings are secured at the close of work as well as in the morning and ensure that there was no illegal entry in the night and no unauthorized person gained entry into the premises. Also, patrolling the entire university environment by day and by night to ensure the safety of lives and property.

Security personnel protect people and property by doing patrols, checking equipment malfunction and things that out of place (Snarski, 2019). It can ensure that buildings are secured, and that students and employees are safe. Security guards can monitor security cameras, security guard equipment, and communication. Having security guard around can bring a heightened sense of security around the entire university. It can help the employees to be more productive and do not have to be worry about the safety while in the university.

Fox and Burstein (2010) stressed that all students and college community members to be fully aware of the safety issues on and around the campus and to take action to prevent and to report illegal and inappropriate activities. Applying personal awareness and personal security practices is the foundation of a safety community. It further emphasized that the concept of campus security is to ensure the safety and security of faculty, students and its staff and aims to decrease violence on campuses throughout the country. While educational institutions continue to educate the youth and develop their intellect, reality would show that schools, particularly the colleges and universities experience the same challenges and threats present in a larger society.

According to De Waal and Grösser (2009), safety and security in education are associated with eradicating physical harm, as can be found in attempts to prohibit dangerous weapons and illegal substances at schools. A broader view, however, reveals any threat to a learner's well-being as a safety and security issue. Creating a safe and successful schools are attained by an effective comprehensive and collaborative efforts requiring the dedication and commitment of all school staff and relevant community members because school safety and positive school climate are not achieved by singular actions like purchasing a designated program or piece of equipment. For this, Haynes and Comer (2006) suggest some effective

approaches to prevent violence and promote learning such as sufficient time to implement these approaches and ongoing evaluation requires for safe schools which are following a cohesive approach that facilitates multidisciplinary collaboration, learning supports (e.g. behavioral, mental health, and social services), instruction, and school management within a comprehensive are fully integrated. In addition, Fennelly (2016) adds utilizing adequate lighting, walkways and entryways to buildings that are clearly visible for members of the community. Landscape should be maintained to minimize obstacles to clear observability and places of concealment for potential assailants. Sidewalks, streets, and parking lots must be clean and free of graffiti. Ensure that there is proper signage and adequate lighting. Signage plays an important role in park security. There should be signs indicating the hours the park is open and rules for those utilizing the space. Proper signage removes the excuses for unacceptable behavior, draws attention to the illegitimate activity, and legitimizes police involvement, thus making the violation of the information on the posted signs an excellent crime prevention tool. According to Pholi (2003), physical security controls, security controls intended to protect material assets and operating environments are essential to network operation and protection. These controls include security alarms, fire alarms, and entry control systems, as well as power backup and environmental monitoring systems, including temperature and humidity control systems. Proper control implementation is essential to assure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information assets.

In a court ruling as cited by Clark (2005), the 1866 case of *People v. Wheaton College* upheld a post-secondary institution's prohibition of student membership in secret societies, resulted in a doctrine called "in loco parentis," literally meaning "in the place of parents." This doctrine made it possible for universities to self-govern in providing care to students who have been entrusted to them and to provide safety for students in the absence of parents. This doctrine also placed additional responsibility in the hands of the college or university and, as a result, made the institution liable for criminal victimizations. In subsequent cases, the courts imposed a duty on colleges and universities in two areas directly related to victimization: (a) a duty to warn students about known risks and (b) a duty to provide students with adequate security protection.

Physical security, like other mechanisms for assuring network and information security, can be difficult to implement (Johnston & Garcia, 2002). Defending assets from all potential threats by all conceivable attackers and means of attack is impractical. Justifying

costs and measuring performance is difficult, due to the difficulty of identifying attempts at attacks and correlating thwarted attempts with specific defenses and potential damage. Security and support processes tend to be reactive in that system hardening is usually undertaken as a specific response to a specific security incident. For instance, the IFSEC Global 2021 CCTV cameras ensure the public safety, rarely will anyone attempt to harm when if it is recorded in camera. It protects against property theft, and vandalism. It is very difficult to get away with stealing something; it will often get caught before or during the process of committing a crime. Having cameras in public places make people feel safe. If people know that there are cameras around people, make feel safer in the knowledge that a potential mugger or attacker will be put-off by the presence of a camera.

FedSec Incorporated discussed the five benefits of having a security guards. It is for crime prevention, instant response time, peace of mind, monitoring and improved customer services. The most common type facility crimes include vandalism, thefts over valuable assets, and assaults that may relate to assets or employees. Professional security guards can prevent such crimes. Research suggests that there was a significant decrease of 16 percent in the total of victim-generated business crimes in areas with security guards. During a dangerous and life-threatening situation, trained security guards can help avoid the loss of lives and guide people to stay calm. With security guards staying near high-at-risk facilities and business divisions, employees and other workers enjoy a sense of peace and security.

2.2 Level of security in the campuses and stakeholders' level of satisfaction

The research study of Pascua (2018) determined the level of satisfaction of respondents on the security systems. This study showed the satisfaction of the respondents on the security system of Cagayan State University Piat Campus that among the three security measures, respondents were moderately satisfied on personnel and document security system. On the other hand, respondents were fairly satisfied with the physical security system. It concluded that the respondents have showed moderate satisfaction on the security systems along personnel and document security system which manifest that the implementation of security measures in the Campus is moderately satisfied.

Mabanglo (2020) concluded that the Philippine College of Science and Technology (PhilCST) is protected and that everyone who work, study or visit the campus feels security assurance; campus security measures are adopted by PhilCST for physical security, document security and personnel security; and the administrators, faculty members, staffs,

students, and visitors of PhilCST have different views on the application of campus security and have different experience and familiarity on the campus security measures adopted by the school. The level of implementation of campus security in PhilCST is fully implemented, suggesting that campus security is available and extensively employed at PhilCST. It implies that the administrators, faculty members, staff, students, and visitors have strong understanding on the need for campus security.

Puckett (2022) investigated the safety and security on campus based on the student perceptions and influence on enrollment. The most important safety-related factor for students when choosing a college was the presence of security measures on campus. This included things like emergency boxes and public safety patrols. Students were shown to be less likely to care about the availability of information pertaining to crime and safety on college/university websites. However, this factor was still deemed to be somewhat important, as were all others assessed within the scale. This suggests that crime- and safety-related factors may be important when choosing a college or university. As such, it points to the need for other researchers to include it as an item when assessing student selection (alongside more traditional options). For parents/guardians, the on-campus crime rate was the most important factor in college/university choice for their child (as perceived by the student respondents). Like students, it was perceived that they viewed the availability of crime and safety information on college/university websites as the least important consideration. As with the student responses, the scale created for parent crime using these and other related items showed that crime and safety played a somewhat important role in choosing a college/university.

Barker (2016) assessed the relationship between student perceptions of university police and the fear of crime felt by students while on campus. Data collection was conducted through a survey methodology using a convenient sample of students in which a self-report survey was sent to the university email addresses of all students enrolled in a southeastern university. Through the employment of a scale developed to assess the perceptions of university police legitimacy and a similar scale to assess fear of crime, the results of the study demonstrate a relationship exists between the variables. The relationship strengthens when demographics are controlled for.

Carrico (2016) determined common factors which influenced students' perceptions of campus safety. Among them were the layout of the campus, the overall appearance of the

campus, adequate lighting, and the security of the campus. The results also showed females were more fearful of becoming victims of crime than males. The study indicated those who carried self-defense pepper spray or an air-horn are in fear of a personal attack on campus. Those who have chosen to carry a self-protection device have more than likely given some thought as to what they would do in the event of an attack, but pepper spray may very well be the last line of defense in an attack situation. Students must be aware of their vulnerability in all situations in order to reduce their individual risk to becoming victims of assault. Campus leaders need to be vigilant in reminding students to avoid walking alone at night, avoid desolate areas, and be aware of their surroundings.

Arasteh (2018) identified several college decisions factors such as campus safety ($M = 4.43$), major ($M = 4.41$), program ($M = 4.39$), and cost ($M = 4.27$). When college decision factors and information sources were compared, a significant relationship was discovered between social media as an information source and campus safety as a college decision factor, with a correlation coefficient of $r = .29$. Institutions of Higher Educations generally avoid displaying campus safety issues or negative news, therefore most and perhaps not all IHEs appear to have a safe campus.

The research conducted by Neema (2003) relate the students' perception on their campus safety and how it affects their academic achievement. Based on the findings, 50.6 percent of students felt safe to study at night on campus, 78.3 percent of the students reported that security personnel were relatively moderate and very effective, and 78.9 percent of the students reported that the safety and security of their room at the hostel residence are well maintained. The majority of students believed that they feel safe on campus. While students, who choose not, claim that it is because of inadequate lighting on the campus area and the insufficiency of security officers within the campus area. While most students in the University of Namibia show that they feel safe, those who feel unsafe hold a precious opinion on how to improve the service.

Normala et al. (2018) explored the student perceptions on the quality of services provided by security officers in the public higher learning institutions. The majority (79.68 percent) of respondents from 310 respondents answered in an affirmative way that they feel safe on campus, it is important to note that 20.32 percent of students feel unsafe on campus. The implications of this discovery, however, a small percentage of students who feel unsafe

are still worrying. The majority of student perceptions stated that they are satisfied with the services they receive from security officers.

The study conducted by Etor et al. (2017) examined the provision of security facilities and security personnel service delivery in Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. The finding of the study showed that there exists a disparity in the provision of security facilities in the institutions with the minimum provision of 11.10 and maximum of 26.00 facilities by State and Federal Universities, respectively. The level of provision of security facilities in the two institutions studies indicated two levels of inadequate and moderate with a grand mean of 2.5135 and standard deviation of .92773. The level of security service delivery in the Universities in Cross River State depend on the level of availability of security facilities for use by security personnel is evident that there are three levels of security service delivery in Universities. The finding of the study also revealed that there is a significant relationship between provision of security facilities and security personnel service delivery.

Ayeo-eo (2023) determined the level of competency of security guards in the performance of their responsibilities. Findings revealed that the level of competency of security guards in the performance of their responsibilities is less competent as perceived by the respondents. Based on the findings of the study, the study concluded that security guards do not perform according to standards. As to the profile gathered, security protective work is primarily for males as well as no professional growth as shown by no other enhancement training.

2.3. Theoretical framework

This study was anchored on two (2) theories namely, Safety and Security Theory of Lukas (2016) and Desire Satisfaction Theory of Bruckner (2010).

Safety and security are top priorities in society and addressing problems in these areas is crucial (Lukas, 2016). Several different kinds of safety and security today include international safety, cyber security, physical security, fire safety and so on. The scientific community is starting to address the creation of a theory of safety and security. Safety and security theories describes safety and security as, has always been, a number one factor when choosing a college.

Parents want to feel comfortable leaving their children in the university's hands, and students want college to become a home away from home. Campus security is a major issue

today, and it is important for campuses to have the necessary security in place to proactively prevent any crimes from occurring, as well as giving everyone a sense of security. Within this theory, if the university has a solid security system in place that has proven to work for many years, a parent is more likely to trust the organization and be comfortable with their child going away to that specific university. This does not only help the university's image, but also helps the parents and students feel secure.

Meanwhile, the Desire Satisfaction Theory, according to Bruckner (2010), considers that an individual's well-being is enhanced when the desires are satisfied. This theory explains the factors that contribute to an individual's satisfaction or dissatisfaction in life. It posits that satisfaction is based on the perceived discrepancy between one's desired level and current level of attainment. People experience greater satisfaction when they perceive that they are making progress towards their goals and feel that they are capable of achieving it. In order to promote satisfaction and well-being, it is important for individuals to set goals that are aligned with the values, interests, and desires. This can involve identifying one's desires as well as exploring different options for achieving one's goal. Desire Satisfaction Theory explains that if the person did not achieve or get the desire, that person will not be happy and satisfied, it will be result of dissatisfaction with something and in life. People believe that getting the desire, is the true satisfaction and happiness.

The Safety and Security Theory and Desire Satisfaction Theory served as a guide to improve the quality of the services that the university need in order to know what should be done to get the satisfaction of the students and employees, as well as to be safe and secure within the university. Safety and security mainly serve to safeguarding against potential threats that can cause harm, it can also encompass physical safety for individuals and organization. With this, students and employees can be satisfied and able to enter the university without fear and can focus to their work and studies.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

The study used descriptive-comparative and cross-sectional method. This method allows the study to describe and compare the level of satisfaction of the students and employees of a state university on the security services.

3.2 Participants of the study

The total population of employees of a state university as of May 2023 were 1,343 and the students were 33, 524. Utilizing the monkey survey calculator, the sample size was 380 students and 300 employees. The sample size was computed with 95% confidence level, 5% margin of error. Purposive sampling technique was employed in the selection of respondents.

3.3 Research instrument

This study used researcher-made and content-validated questionnaire as a tool in gathering necessary data. The questionnaire was created to elicit responses to the specific problems addressed in the study. The constructed statements in the questionnaire were based on the review of related literature and studies. The researchers also consulted people who are experts in the field to go over the questionnaire in order to determine whether the questions were categorized correctly. Suggestions, comments, and recommendations were addressed by the researchers for the enhancement of the instrument.

After the validation of research instrument, pilot test among 20 respondents was conducted to establish the reliability of the instrument prior to the actual survey. The reliability test revealed that the security personnel conduct, physical security, and protection of sensitive information obtained a Cronbach $\alpha = 0.76, 0.74, \text{ and } 0.79$ respectively which were interpreted as “acceptable.”

The final draft of instrument consisted of three parts. First part included the cover letter to inform and encourage respondents to accomplish the instrument. Second part determined the respondent’s campus role whether they were student or employee. Last part of the instrument dealt with the level of satisfaction on the security services. The variables included were security personnel conduct, physical security and protection of sensitive information. These categories were given ten statements each. In this part, the respondents are requested to rate each item using the following four (4) point rating scale with their designated verbal interpretation: 4-Highly Satisfied, 3-Moderately Satisfied, 2-Satisfied, and 1-Less Satisfied.

3.4 Data gathering procedure

Prior to the distribution of questionnaires, the researchers formally requested a permission through the Office of the Campus Directors of the targeted state university for the conduct the survey. Upon approval, the respondents proceed with the actual survey which

was done in face-to-face. The printed survey questionnaires were disseminated to the target respondents, and were given an enough time to accomplish the same. The survey was completed by the respondents in an average of 10 minutes including the briefing among the respondents regarding the purpose and instruction in the accomplishment of the survey. After the administration of the questionnaire, it was immediately retrieved to ensured high percentage of retrieval.

With regards to the research ethics, the researchers asked the consent of the concerned offices to allow the conduct of the study in the campus premises. Further, the respondents were informed on the purpose of the study and their participation is voluntary. These respondents were given an assurance that they have the right to protect their identity by not giving their complete names. Furthermore, any data gathered were kept strictly confidential and anonymous in compliance with the Republic Act of 10173, also known as the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

3.5 Statistical treatment of data

The study used the quantitative method, which collected quantifiable data from the population sample for statistical analysis. The data gathered, through the survey questionnaire, was analyzed and interpreted through mean, standard deviation and t-test.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1 presents the mean level of satisfaction of respondents regarding the security services of a state university, specifically focusing on the conduct of security personnel. The table provides insights into the satisfaction levels of both students and employees, with mean scores, standard deviations, and descriptive interpretations for each statement.

Among students, the highest mean score of 3.74 was obtained for statement 8, which emphasizes the importance of treating everyone with respect. This indicates that students highly appreciate security personnel who demonstrate respect towards all individuals. Conversely, statement 5 received the lowest mean score of 3.47, indicating a slightly lower level of satisfaction among students regarding security personnel's ability to consistently act in a calm manner. This shows that the students are often reprimanded for not following the correct wearing of uniform and I.D., causing to the security personnel to not act always in a calm manner.

For employees, statement 7 obtained the highest mean score of 3.74, reflecting their high level of satisfaction with security personnel who are polite and courteous. This merely demonstrate that the employees highly appreciate security personnel showing politeness and courtesy. On the other hand, statement 10 received the lowest mean score of 3.57, suggesting a slight decrease in satisfaction among employees regarding security personnel.

Table 1

Level of satisfaction on the security services in terms of security personnel conduct

STATEMENTS	Student			Employee		
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI
1. Treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are.	3.59	0.53	Highly Satisfied	3.64	0.51	Highly Satisfied
2. Communicate to client in a professional manner.	3.51	0.54	Highly Satisfied	3.58	0.49	Highly Satisfied
3. Is readily available to serve the client's needs.	3.60	0.53	Highly Satisfied	3.63	0.51	Highly Satisfied
4. Is always alert and aware of surroundings.	3.66	0.54	Highly Satisfied	3.66	0.50	Highly Satisfied
5. Always act in a calm manner.	3.47	0.55	Highly Satisfied	3.56	0.50	Highly Satisfied
6. Perform duties with diligence.	3.63	0.54	Highly Satisfied	3.71	0.46	Highly Satisfied
7. Is polite and courteous.	3.63	0.53	Highly Satisfied	3.74	0.44	Highly Satisfied
8. Treat everyone with respect.	3.74	0.47	Highly Satisfied	3.77	0.42	Highly Satisfied
9. Perform duties with honesty and integrity.	3.65	0.52	Highly Satisfied	3.72	0.45	Highly Satisfied
10. Always in proper uniform.	3.52	0.60	Highly Satisfied	3.57	0.50	Highly Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.60	0.39	Highly Satisfied	3.66	0.34	Highly Satisfied

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Satisfied; 2.50-3.24 Moderately Satisfied; 1.75-2.49 Satisfied; 1.00-1.74 Less Satisfied; SD=Standard Deviation; DI=Descriptive Interpretation

The composite mean for student respondents was calculated to be 3.60, indicating an overall high level of satisfaction with security personnel conduct. Similarly, the composite mean for employee respondents was 3.66, signifying their high satisfaction with the conduct of security personnel as well. Both categories exhibited low standard deviations, implying minimal variability among respondents' scores and a high level of agreement. However, this

finding contradicts with the study of Ayeo-eo (2023), which the respondents assessed the level of competency of security guards in the performance of their responsibilities is less competent. Based on the findings of the study, security guards do not perform according to standards.

Table 2 presents the mean level of satisfaction among respondents regarding the security services, specifically focusing on physical security measures. The table provides insights into the satisfaction levels of both students and employees, including mean scores, standard deviations, and descriptive interpretations for each statement.

Table 2

Level of Satisfaction on the security services in terms of physical security

STATEMENTS	Student			Employee		
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI
1. Fences are tall enough to reduce unauthorized access to property.	3.26	0.63	Highly Satisfied	3.31	0.58	Highly Satisfied
2. Security personnel inquire about anyone who enters the campus without authorization	3.27	0.64	Highly Satisfied	3.34	0.60	Highly Satisfied
3. There are installed barbed wires on the perimeter fence campus.	2.77	0.70	Moderately Satisfied	2.87	0.37	Moderately Satisfied
4. When campus is closed, gates and doors are secured with and/or chains.	3.31	0.73	Highly Satisfied	3.63	0.51	Highly Satisfied
5. The campus is monitored by CCTV Cameras 24 hours a day.	3.35	0.77	Highly Satisfied	3.73	0.44	Highly Satisfied
6. The campus is provided with proper perimeter fence.	3.32	0.67	Highly Satisfied	3.33	0.64	Highly Satisfied
7. Fences are regularly check by the security for holes, damage access points.	3.36	0.71	Highly Satisfied	3.37	0.63	Highly Satisfied
8. Entrance/ Exit points are protected by the gate.	3.45	0.60	Highly Satisfied	3.45	0.52	Highly Satisfied
9. Campus is equipped with proper lighting on entrances possible points of possible intrusion.	3.41	0.63	Highly Satisfied	3.38	0.55	Highly Satisfied
10. Campus is equipped with grills to protect windows of classroom, offices, laboratories and the high risk areas.	3.34	0.63	Highly Satisfied	3.62	0.49	Highly Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.29	0.48	Highly Satisfied	3.40	0.34	Highly Satisfied

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Satisfied; 2.50-3.24 Moderately Satisfied; 1.75-2.49 Satisfied; 1.00-1.74 Less Satisfied; SD=Standard Deviation; DI=Descriptive Interpretation

Among students, the highest mean score of 3.45 was obtained for statement 8, which emphasizes the protection provided by gates at entrance and exit points. This indicates that students highly appreciate the security measures in place to safeguard these areas. Conversely, statement 3 received the lowest mean score of 2.77, suggesting a moderately satisfied level of satisfaction among students regarding the presence of installed barbed wires on the perimeter fence of the campus. This merely demonstrate that the students observe the seldom of barbed wires in the perimeter fence of the university.

For employees, statement 5 obtained the highest mean score of 3.73, reflecting their high level of satisfaction with the continuous CCTV monitoring of the campus. This emphasize that the employees highly appreciate the continuous CCTV monitoring in the university. On the other hand, statement 3 received the lowest mean score of 2.87, indicating a similar moderately satisfied level of satisfaction among employees regarding the presence of installed barbed wires on the perimeter fence. This demonstrate that the employees also observe the seldom of barbed wires in the perimeter fence of the university.

The composite mean for student respondents was calculated to be 3.29, indicating an overall high level of satisfaction with the physical security measures, indicating that the students highly appreciate the security services in terms of physical security implemented in the university. Similarly, the composite mean for employee respondents was 3.40, signifying their high satisfaction with the physical security measures as well. Both categories exhibited low standard deviations, suggesting minimal variability among respondents' scores and a high level of agreement. This indicate that both students and employee was highly satisfied and appreciated the security services in physical security measures in the university. This finding, on the other hand, opposed Pascua (2018), which revealed that the satisfaction of the respondents on the physical security system was “fair.”

Table 3 presents the mean level of satisfaction among respondents regarding the security services on the protection of sensitive information. The table provides insights into the satisfaction levels of both students and employees, including mean scores, standard deviations, and descriptive interpretations for each statement.

Table 3*Level of satisfaction on the security services in terms of protection of sensitive information*

STATEMENTS	Student			Employee		
	Mean	SD	DI	Mean	SD	DI
1. Comply with state data privacy laws.	3.47	0.55	Highly Satisfied	3.51	0.50	Highly Satisfied
2. Protect confidential information from being used for malicious	3.54	0.52	Highly Satisfied	3.56	0.50	Highly Satisfied
3. Protect sensitive information from being released to public.	3.57	0.50	Highly Satisfied	3.53	0.50	Highly Satisfied
4. Dispose the records properly.	3.43	0.52	Highly Satisfied	3.44	0.50	Highly Satisfied
5. Minimize data collection of student information if not necessary.	3.38	0.62	Highly Satisfied	3.50	0.53	Highly Satisfied
6. Ensure all collected information are protected with locked cabinets.	3.42	0.56	Highly Satisfied	3.49	0.50	Highly Satisfied
7. Control access to confidential information.	3.55	0.54	Highly Satisfied	3.54	0.50	Highly Satisfied
8. Inform the client's data privacy rights.	3.56	0.55	Highly Satisfied	3.58	0.49	Highly Satisfied
9. Ensure the integrity and confidentiality of client's information.	3.55	0.54	Highly Satisfied	3.53	0.50	Highly Satisfied
10. Inform clients of the purpose of information collection.	3.62	0.50	Highly Satisfied	3.58	0.49	Highly Satisfied
Overall Mean	3.51	0.40	Highly Satisfied	3.53	0.39	Highly Satisfied

Legend: 3.25-4.00 Highly Satisfied; 2.50-3.24 Moderately Satisfied; 1.75-2.49 Satisfied; 1.00-1.74 Less Satisfied; SD=Standard Deviation; DI=Descriptive Interpretation

Among students, the highest mean score of 3.62 was obtained for statement 10, which emphasizes the importance of informing clients about the purpose of information collection. This indicates that students highly appreciate being informed about why their information is being collected. Conversely, statement 5 received the lowest mean score of 3.38, suggesting a slightly lower level of satisfaction among students regarding the minimization of data collection if not necessary, which indicates that the students want to minimize the data collection in the university if not necessary.

For employees, statement 10 also obtained the highest mean score of 3.58, reflecting their high level of satisfaction with informing clients about the purpose of information collection. This shows that the employees also highly appreciate being informed about the purpose of information collection. On the other hand, statement 4 received the lowest mean

score of 3.44, indicating a slightly lower level of satisfaction among employees regarding the proper disposal of records. This indicate that the employees observe the disposal of records is not properly disposed.

The composite mean for student respondents was calculated to be 3.51, indicating an overall high level of satisfaction with the protection of sensitive information. Similarly, the composite mean for employee respondents was 3.53, signifying their high satisfaction with the protection of sensitive information as well. This denote that the students and employees was highly appreciate the security services in terms of protecting sensitive information being collected and obtained in the university. Both categories exhibited low standard deviations, suggesting minimal variability among respondents' scores and a high level of agreement. This signify that the students and employees' satisfaction in the protection of sensitive information was almost alike. This finding was supported by Donnellon (2018) that academic institutions of all kinds have unique challenges to overcome when it comes to managing sensitive information. Managing sensitive document are hugely important for ensuring the security and continued reliability of school systems. It provides the best way to ensure that cyber security solutions remain.

Table 4

Test of significant difference between the groups of respondents' level of satisfaction in the security services

Security Services	Mean Difference	Df	t-value	Decision
Security Personnel Conduct	-0.06		-2.03	Reject Ho
Physical Security	-1.18	678	-3.62	Reject Ho
Protection of Sensitive Information	-0.02		-0.54	Accept Ho

Table 4 presents the results of the test of significant difference between the assessment of two groups of respondents, namely students and employees, regarding their level of satisfaction in the security services of the University. The table includes the mean difference, t-value, and the decision made based on the test.

For the variable "security personnel conduct," the mean difference between the satisfaction levels of students and employees is -0.06. The corresponding t-value is -2.03. With a zero-similarity index, indicating no similarity between the mean scores of the two

groups, the decision made is to reject the null hypothesis (H_0). This implies that there was a significant difference in the level of satisfaction between students and employees regarding security personnel conduct. This simply indicates that students and employees have different level of satisfaction in the security services. Employees are treated better than the students, which justifies tighter policies for the students.

For the variable "physical security," the mean difference is -1.18, and the t-value is -3.62. With a zero-similarity index, the decision is again to reject the null hypothesis. This suggests a significant difference in the level of satisfaction between students and employees regarding physical security. However, for the variable "protection of sensitive information," the mean difference is -0.02, and the t-value is -0.54. Despite the zero-similarity index, the decision is to accept the null hypothesis (H_0). This indicates that there was no significant difference in the level of satisfaction between students and employees regarding the protection of sensitive information. This simply shows that the level of satisfaction of students and employees in the protection of sensitive information are the same. There is no difference on how the university protected the students and employees record and information.

5. Conclusion

This study found that both respondents possessed a high level of satisfaction on the security services across all the variables. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected for security personnel conduct and physical security, indicating significant differences in the satisfaction between students and employees. On the other hand, the null hypothesis for the protection of sensitive information suggested no significant difference in the satisfaction between the two groups.

Given the results of the study, the University administration is encouraged to conduct regular training for security personnel to improve professionalism and maintain a calm demeanor. The head of security office may help their personnel to prioritize professionalism, treating everyone with respect, and maintaining positive communication. Collaboration with the university administration is crucial to identify and implement improvements to physical

security measures. Additionally, security personnel should enhance their awareness of proper handling and disposal of sensitive information, emphasizing data privacy and confidentiality.

Students may actively communicate with the university administration and security personnel to voice concerns and suggestions for security service improvements. Participation in security awareness campaigns and initiatives is vital for promoting a safe campus environment. Students should stay informed about the university's policies on protecting sensitive information and promptly report any breaches or concerns to the relevant authorities.

Employees may offer feedback and suggestions to improve security services, ensuring their perspectives are considered. Active involvement in promoting a culture of security by following protocols and encouraging colleagues is crucial. Employees should remain vigilant, reporting any suspicious activities or security incidents promptly.

Future researchers may consider the conduct of continuing evaluation to have a comprehensive understanding of its services to develop better improvement strategies.

References

- Arasteh, R. (2018). *Public perception of campus security issues at institutions of higher education in United States*. [Dissertation, Pepperdine University]. Theses and Dissertations. 932. <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/932>
- Ayeo-eo, S. P. (2023). The competency of security guards in the performance of their responsibilities. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 9(5), 133-144. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13267>
- Bassey, R. E. (2009). *General principles of security*. The African Council on Narcotics and Crime Prevention. Jos, Nigeria.
- Barker, C. N. (2016). *Policing postsecondary education: University police legitimacy and fear of crime on campus*. [Master's thesis, East Tennessee State University] Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3169. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3169>

- Bruckner, D. W. (2010). Subjective well-being and desire satisfaction. *Philosophical Papers*, 39(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641003669409>
- Carrico, B. A. (2016). *The effects of students' perceptions of campus safety and security on student enrollment*. [Doctoral dissertation, Marshall University] Theses, Dissertations and Capstones. 1006. <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd/1006>
- Clark C.A (2005). Crime and fear on campus. *Policing an International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 25(1), 14-31.
- Crossman, A. (2018). *Understanding purposive sampling: An overview of the method and its applications*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/purposive-sampling-3026727>
- De Waal, E., & Grösser, M. M. (2009). Safety and security at school: A pedagogical perspective. *Teaching and teacher education*, 25(5), 697-706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.12.002>
- Díaz-Vicario, A., & Gairín Sallán, J. (2017). A comprehensive approach to managing school safety: case studies in Catalonia, Spain. *Educational Research*, 59(1), 89-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2016.1272430>
- Donnellon, C. (2018). Violence on college campuses: Understanding its impact on student well-being. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 24(10), 78-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920050179835>
- Etor, C. R., Etudor-Eyo, E., & Ukpabio, G. E. (2020). Provision of security facilities and security personnel service delivery in universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Education Studies*, 13(5), 125-131. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n5p125>
- Fennelly, L. J. (Ed.). (2016). *Effective physical security*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Fox, J. A., & Burstein, H. (2010). *Violence and security on campus: From preschool through college*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Grayson, J. L., (2012). The 5 pillars of great campus security. *Campus Safety*. <https://www.campussafetymagazine.com/safety/the-5-pillars-of-great-campus-security/>

- Haynes, N. M., & Comer, J. P. (1996). Integrating schools, families, and communities through successful school reform: The school development program. *School Psychology Review*, 25(4), 501-506.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.1996.12085838>
- IFSEC Global. (2021). *Role of CCTV cameras: Public, privacy and protection*.
<https://www.ifsecglobal.com/video-surveillance/role-cctv-cameras-public-privacy-protection/>
- Jian, R. K., & Rao, S. S. (2011). *Industrial safety health and environment systems*. New Delhi: Khana Publishers.
- Johnston, R.G., & Garcia, A. R. (2002). *Effective vulnerability assessments for physical security devices, systems, and programs*. Los Alamos National Laboratory.
<https://doi.org/10.2172/801237>
- Lukas, L. (2016). Theoretical sources for a theory of safety and security. In *The Tenth International Conference on Emerging Security Information, Systems and Technologies*, SECUREWARE.
https://www.thinkmind.org/articles/securware_2016_8_20_30071.pdf
- Mabanglo, J. L. (2020). Campus security practices assessment of Philippine College of Science and Technology. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 4(4), 14-19.
- Neema, I. (2003). *Resident student perceptions of on-campus living and study environments at the University of Namibia and their relation to academic performance* [Doctoral dissertation, Worcester Polytechnic Institute]. UNAM Digital Collections.
<http://hdl.handle.net/11070.1/4438>
- Normala, R., & Azlini, C. (2018). Student perceptions of security services at public higher learning institutions. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 2(12), 379-382.

- Pascua, J. R. (2018). Employees' level of satisfaction on the implementation of the security and safety practices at Cagayan State University-Piat Campus. *International Journal of Advance Research in Management and Social Science*, 7(7), 44-81
- Pholi, L. (2003). *Security in practice reducing the effort*. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=f29b672539b2c341fb13a705f71aae51b0615096>
- Puckett, K. (2022). *Safety and security on campus: Student perceptions and influence on enrollment* [Doctoral dissertation, East Tennessee State University] Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 4103. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/4103>
- Senate Bill 1324 (2010). *Campus Security Act - Senate of the Philippines*. <https://legacy.senate.gov.ph/lisdata/88567398!.pdf>
- Snarski, R. (2023, June 27). *Security guard booths, Importance of security presence*. Guardian Booth. <https://www.guardianbooth.com/how-important-are-security-guards/>