

Roles, Challenges, and Institutional Responses of Security Personnel in Ensuring Campus Safety at Tangub City Global College

Kenneth Rey B. Embodo¹, Reyzen T. Fernandez², Jhenny T. Degrano³, Grichen T. Bation⁴

Author Information:

¹⁻⁴ Institute of Arts and Sciences, Tangub City Global College, Maloro, Tangub City, Misamis Occidental, Philippines

Correspondence:

kennethreyembodo@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: June 29, 2026

Date Revised: July 25, 2025

Date Accepted: July 27, 2026

Date Published: August 03, 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21703639>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0250

Recommended Citation:

Embodo, K. R. B., Fernandez, R. T., Degrano, J. T. & Bation, G. T. (2026). Roles, Challenges, and Institutional Responses of Security Personnel in Ensuring Campus Safety at Tangub City Global College. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(6), 442-454. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21703639>

Abstract. Campus safety is a fundamental concern in higher education institutions worldwide, yet the roles, experiences, and operational challenges of security personnel in government-funded Philippine higher education institutions remain underexplored. This qualitative descriptive study examined the roles, responsibilities, challenges, and institutional responses of security personnel at Tangub City Global College, a government-funded institution in Misamis Occidental, Philippines. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten (10) purposively selected security personnel, including both gate and roving patrol personnel with direct responsibilities for implementing campus safety and security operations. Data were analyzed through six-phase thematic analysis. Five overarching themes emerged: (1) Strict Enforcement of Safety Protocols and Institutional Policies, highlighting participants' responsibilities in access control, campus patrols, and policy enforcement; (2) Difficulties in Managing Non-Compliant Students and Outsiders, reflecting the interpersonal and behavioral challenges encountered in maintaining campus order; (3) Institutional and Operational Challenges, encompassing personnel-related issues, theft incidents, resource limitations, and communication gaps; (4) Continuous Professional Development and Institutional Safety Strategies, emphasizing institutional initiatives that strengthened personnel competence through training, safety orientations, and competency certification; and (5) Inter-Agency Collaboration for Campus Safety, illustrating how partnerships with government emergency response and law enforcement agencies enhanced the institution's overall safety capacity. The findings demonstrate that effective campus safety extends beyond routine security functions and depends on sustained institutional support, continuous professional development, and collaborative governance. By providing an in-depth qualitative account of security personnel's experiences in a regional government-funded higher education institution, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on campus security management in resource-constrained educational settings and offers practical insights for strengthening institutional safety policies, organizational resilience, and community-oriented security practices in comparable contexts.

Keywords: campus safety; higher education institutions; institutional safety management; qualitative research; security personnel

Introduction

The safety and security of higher education institutions have become increasingly important concerns worldwide as universities and colleges strive to provide learning environments that are conducive to academic excellence, institutional resilience, and student well-being. Beyond serving as a logistical necessity, campus safety is widely recognized as a fundamental condition for effective teaching, learning, research, and community engagement (Moore et al., 2025). As higher education institutions continue to accommodate diverse populations and respond to evolving security risks, security personnel play a vital role in maintaining institutional order, preventing security incidents, enforcing campus regulations, and responding promptly to emergencies. Their responsibilities extend beyond traditional surveillance functions to include fostering a secure environment that supports the overall educational mission of the institution.

Within the Philippine context, institutional safety planning and clearly communicated policies remain essential to secure learning environments (Cabasal et al., 2023). Government-funded higher education institutions, particularly those located in regional areas, frequently operate under resource constraints that affect infrastructure, personnel, and technological capabilities. Consequently, campus security personnel are often required to perform multiple responsibilities while balancing strict enforcement of institutional policies with community-oriented approaches that promote trust, cooperation, and student

welfare. These conditions underscore the need to understand how security personnel navigate their roles within institutional environments characterized by limited resources, diverse stakeholders, and increasing demands for effective campus governance.

Existing scholarship has examined various dimensions of campus safety, including stakeholder perceptions of institutional security measures (Dlamini & Olanrewaju, 2021; Azevedo et al., 2022), the operational roles and responsibilities of campus security personnel (Moore et al., 2025; Corradi et al., 2020), the influence of environmental design on safety outcomes (Zhang et al., 2023), and the challenges associated with managing non-compliant individuals, coordinating with law enforcement agencies, and accessing adequate training and organizational resources (Basham, 2020). Although these studies have significantly advanced the understanding of campus security, much of the existing literature has been conducted in Western institutional settings characterized by different organizational structures, resource capacities, and socio-cultural environments. Comparatively little empirical research has explored the experiences of security personnel within Philippine higher education institutions, particularly in smaller government-funded colleges situated outside major urban centers (Tejano, 2023). Furthermore, existing local studies have largely emphasized institutional safety policies and stakeholder perceptions, while the lived experiences, operational realities, and organizational support mechanisms of campus security personnel remain insufficiently documented (Sepadi & Chadyiwa, 2025).

Tangub City Global College (TCGC), formerly known as Gov. Alfonso D. Tan College (GADTC), is a government-funded higher education institution established in 1984 and located in Maloro, Tangub City, Misamis Occidental. At the time of data collection during the second semester of Academic Year 2023–2024, the College comprised six academic institutes offering fifteen undergraduate academic programs that serves students from Tangub City and neighbouring municipalities. As a semi-open campus that functions not only as an educational institution but also as a community-accessible public space, TCGC encounters distinct security demands involving the continuous movement of students, faculty members, administrative personnel, visitors, and community stakeholders. These institutional characteristics require security personnel to perform diverse operational, regulatory, and emergency response functions while maintaining an environment that supports both public accessibility and institutional safety. Despite the critical role they perform in sustaining campus operations, no documented qualitative study has comprehensively examined their lived experiences, workplace challenges, and the institutional mechanisms designed to support their responsibilities.

Addressing this gap, the present study explored the roles, responsibilities, challenges, and institutional responses experienced by security personnel at Tangub City Global College through qualitative semi-structured interviews. By generating an evidence-based understanding of campus security practices within a regional government-funded higher education institution, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on campus safety, organizational security management, and community-oriented institutional governance. The findings are expected to inform the development of context-sensitive safety policies, targeted professional development initiatives, and collaborative security strategies that strengthen institutional resilience. While grounded in the experiences of security personnel at TCGC, the study offers practical and scholarly insights that may benefit comparable government-funded higher education institutions in the Philippines and other resource-constrained educational settings facing similar organizational and security challenges.

Research Questions

This study aimed to explore the roles, challenges, and institutional responses associated with campus safety as experienced by security personnel at Tangub City Global College. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What roles and responsibilities do security personnel perform in ensuring campus safety at Tangub City Global College?
2. What operational and organizational challenges do security personnel encounter in the effective performance of their duties?
3. What institutional programs, policies, and strategies has Tangub City Global College implemented to support and enhance the effectiveness of its security personnel in maintaining campus safety?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study focused on examining the roles, responsibilities, challenges, and institutional support mechanisms of security personnel in ensuring campus safety at Tangub City Global College (TCGC). It was conducted exclusively within the TCGC campus in Maloro, Tangub City, Misamis Occidental, during the second semester of Academic Year 2023–2024. The participants consisted of ten (10) purposively selected security personnel who were directly involved in implementing campus safety and security operations. The

participant group included gate security personnel ("gaters"), roving patrol officers ("rooving"), and the Head of the Security and Safety Office, thereby representing both frontline operational personnel and supervisory leadership. This variation in roles enabled the study to capture diverse perspectives on the implementation of campus safety protocols, operational challenges, and institutional support mechanisms. Semi-structured individual interviews served as the sole method of data collection, allowing participants to provide rich and detailed accounts of their experiences, responsibilities, workplace challenges, and perceptions of institutional support. The study was delimited to the perspectives of security personnel employed at Tangub City Global College during the period of data collection. It did not include administrators, faculty members, students, or security personnel from other higher education institutions. Likewise, the study did not employ quantitative methods or seek to statistically generalize its findings beyond the research setting. Instead, the findings should be interpreted as context-specific insights into campus safety practices within a regional government-funded higher education institution. Nevertheless, the rich description of the institutional context and participants' experiences may enable readers to determine the transferability of the findings to comparable higher education institutions operating under similar organizational, administrative, and resource conditions.

Literature Review

Campus Safety in Higher Education

Campus safety has become an increasingly important concern in higher education institutions as universities and colleges seek to provide learning environments that promote academic excellence, student well-being, and institutional resilience. Contemporary literature views campus safety as a multidimensional concept encompassing physical security, emergency preparedness, institutional policies, and stakeholder collaboration rather than merely the prevention of crime or disorder (Moore et al., 2025; Dlamini & Olanrewaju, 2021). Effective campus safety systems therefore require coordinated efforts among institutional administrators, security personnel, faculty members, students, and external agencies to create a secure and supportive educational environment. Beyond human resources, institutional planning, emergency preparedness, and coordinated safety practices are central to campus safety (Moore et al., 2025). Within the Philippine context, Cabasal et al. (2023) likewise recognize that systematic safety planning and clearly communicated institutional policies are essential to creating secure learning environments. Nevertheless, much of the literature has concentrated on institutional safety systems and stakeholder perceptions, while comparatively little attention has been devoted to understanding how campus security personnel themselves experience the day-to-day implementation of these safety measures, particularly within government-funded higher education institutions operating under limited organizational resources.

Roles and Responsibilities of Security Personnel

Security personnel serve as the frontline implementers of institutional safety policies and play a central role in maintaining order within higher education institutions (Moore et al., 2025; Basham, 2020; Corradi et al., 2020). In higher education institutions, security operations typically center on access control, patrol, emergency readiness, and coordination with stakeholders (Moore et al., 2025). These responsibilities require not only technical competence but also sound judgment, interpersonal communication, and the ability to respond effectively to diverse situations while maintaining professionalism and public trust (Basham, 2020; Moore et al., 2025). Recent studies further suggest that the effectiveness of campus security personnel depends not only on clearly defined responsibilities but also on continuous institutional support through professional development, adequate resources, and collaborative governance. Basham (2022) observed that Philippine university security offices have gradually evolved from traditional guarding functions toward more service-oriented and community-centered approaches characterized by inter-unit collaboration and clearly established operational procedures. Zhang et al. (2023) further found that campus security personnel in Malaysian universities identified resource limitations and equipment gaps as key barriers to effective security operations. Collectively, these studies indicate that effective campus security relies on the integration of professional competencies, institutional support, and collaborative organizational practices. However, there remains limited qualitative evidence describing how security personnel themselves perceive these responsibilities within the unique operational realities of regional government-funded higher education institutions in the Philippines.

Challenges in Campus Security

Despite their essential role in maintaining institutional safety, security personnel frequently encounter operational, organizational, and interpersonal challenges that affect the effective performance of their duties. Resource limitations, staffing gaps, communication barriers, and inconsistent policy

implementation are recurring challenges in campus security operations (Moore et al., 2025). These challenges often require security personnel to manage multiple responsibilities simultaneously while responding to evolving security risks and the expectations of various campus stakeholders. Such conditions underscore the importance of organizational support systems that enable security personnel to perform their responsibilities efficiently and consistently. Beyond operational concerns, the effectiveness of campus security is also shaped by the social and cultural dynamics of the academic community. Simpeh and Adisa (2021) observed that campus safety measures may be perceived differently across student groups, emphasizing the importance of implementing security practices that are equitable, respectful, and responsive to the diverse needs of the campus population. Similarly, research has shown that managing non-compliant individuals, addressing behavioral conflicts, and maintaining positive relationships with students and visitors require security personnel to exercise discretion, effective communication, and conflict resolution skills in addition to enforcing institutional policies (Simpeh & Adisa, 2021; Basham, 2020; Adisa & Simpeh, 2019). Sepadi and Chadyiwa (2025) further documented that institutional communication gaps and inconsistent safety policies create systemic vulnerabilities in campus security systems. While these studies provide valuable insights into the challenges associated with campus security, limited qualitative research has examined how security personnel in Philippine government-funded higher education institutions experience these operational realities within resource-constrained institutional settings.

Community Policing as an Analytical Lens

This study adopts a collaborative campus safety lens that emphasizes shared responsibility, inter-agency coordination, and continuous communication among stakeholders (Moore et al., 2025; Basham, 2020). Rather than focusing solely on enforcement, this perspective recognizes that sustainable safety is achieved through continuous communication, partnership, and cooperation among stakeholders. Within higher education institutions, community policing encourages security personnel to function not only as law enforcers but also as facilitators of a safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environment. The community policing perspective is particularly relevant to Tangub City Global College because of its semi-open campus environment, where students, employees, visitors, and members of the surrounding community regularly interact within shared institutional spaces. In such a setting, security personnel are required to balance the consistent enforcement of institutional policies with respectful engagement, public service, and collaborative coordination with external agencies. This perspective likewise recognizes that effective campus safety depends on organizational support mechanisms, including continuous professional development, clear communication systems, institutional leadership, and inter-agency collaboration. Guided by these principles, community policing provides an appropriate framework for interpreting how security personnel perform their responsibilities, respond to workplace challenges, and contribute to the development of a safe and supportive campus environment. Consequently, this analytical lens informs the analysis and discussion of the study's findings by situating participants' experiences within the broader context of collaborative institutional safety and community-oriented security management. Taken together, the reviewed literature suggests that effective campus safety is a multidimensional institutional responsibility that depends on the integration of sound organizational policies, competent security personnel, continuous institutional support, and collaborative engagement among internal and external stakeholders. While previous studies have substantially advanced the understanding of campus safety systems, security practices, and community-oriented approaches, existing research has largely focused on institutional policies, stakeholder perceptions, and higher education settings in Western contexts. Comparatively little qualitative evidence has explored the lived experiences, operational challenges, and institutional support mechanisms of security personnel in regional government-funded higher education institutions in the Philippines. Addressing this gap, the present study examines the experiences of security personnel at Tangub City Global College to provide context-specific insights that contribute to the broader discourse on campus safety management and organizational security practices in higher education.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the roles, responsibilities, challenges, and institutional responses related to campus safety among security personnel at Tangub City Global College (TCGC). A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the study sought to understand participants' experiences, perspectives, and interpretations within their natural work environment rather than measure predetermined variables or test causal relationships (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Specifically, a qualitative descriptive design was adopted because it enables researchers to provide comprehensive and straightforward descriptions of participants' experiences while remaining close to the

data and minimizing extensive theoretical interpretation (Merriam, 2009). The study utilized thematic analysis following the six-phase framework of Braun and Clarke (2006), consisting of data familiarization, initial coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition and naming, and report writing. This analytical approach was selected because it provides a systematic and flexible procedure for identifying recurring patterns and meanings across participants' narratives while preserving the richness and contextual nature of qualitative data.

Sampling Design

Participants were selected using purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique commonly employed in qualitative research to deliberately identify individuals who possess specific knowledge, experience, or characteristics directly relevant to the phenomenon under investigation (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This approach was appropriate for the present study because it ensured that all participants had direct and substantive involvement in campus safety and security operations at Tangub City Global College. Inclusion criteria required that participants: (a) be currently and actively employed as security personnel at TCGC at the time of data collection; (b) have direct responsibility for implementing campus safety policies and security procedures; and (c) voluntarily agree to participate in the study through written informed consent. A sample of ten (10) participants was considered adequate because qualitative descriptive research prioritizes information richness and depth of understanding over statistical representation, and data collection continued until sufficient information was obtained to comprehensively address the three research questions.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at Tangub City Global College (TCGC), a government-funded higher education institution located in Maloro, Tangub City, Misamis Occidental, Philippines. Formerly known as Gov. Alfonso D. Tan College (GADTC), the institution was established in 1984 and currently comprises six academic institutes offering fifteen undergraduate academic programs. As a semi-open campus that accommodates students, employees, visitors, and members of the surrounding community, TCGC presents distinctive campus safety and security demands. The institution's Safety and Security Office consists of sixteen (16) security personnel assigned to two primary operational functions: gate security personnel, who regulate campus entry and exit, and roving patrol officers, who are responsible for continuously monitoring campus facilities and responding to security-related incidents. These operational characteristics made TCGC an appropriate setting for examining the experiences of security personnel in maintaining campus safety within a regional government-funded higher education institution.

Research Participants

The participants consisted of ten (10) purposively selected security personnel employed by the Safety and Security Office of Tangub City Global College. At the time of data collection, the office comprised sixteen (16) security personnel, from whom participants were selected based on their direct involvement in implementing campus safety and security operations and their ability to provide rich, experience-based information relevant to the study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). The participant group included gate security personnel, roving patrol officers, and the Head of the Safety and Security Office, thereby representing both frontline operational personnel and supervisory leadership. This variation in roles enabled the study to capture diverse perspectives regarding security responsibilities, operational challenges, institutional policies, and organizational support mechanisms. A sample of ten participants was considered adequate because qualitative descriptive research prioritizes information richness and depth of understanding over statistical representation, and data collection continued until sufficient information was obtained to comprehensively address the research questions.

Research Instrument

Data were collected through a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide. Consistent with qualitative inquiry, the researcher served as the primary research instrument responsible for conducting interviews, facilitating discussion, and interpreting participants' responses (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The interview guide consisted of open-ended questions organized according to the study's research objectives. These covered participants' roles and responsibilities, campus safety practices, challenges encountered during security operations, institutional programs and policies supporting security personnel, and collaborative partnerships with external agencies. Follow-up and probing questions were employed throughout the interviews to encourage participants to elaborate on their experiences and provide detailed descriptions. Prior to data collection, the interview guide underwent content validation by the researcher's faculty adviser. Suggestions and recommendations were incorporated to improve the clarity, relevance, and alignment of the interview questions with the study's objectives.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before conducting the study, formal approval was obtained from the Head of the Safety and Security Office of Tangub City Global College. Eligible participants were informed of the study's objectives, procedures, voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality measures, and their right to withdraw from the study at any point without consequence. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to the interviews. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted individually at mutually convenient times and locations within the campus to ensure privacy and encourage open discussion. With participants' permission, all interviews were audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed verbatim. The researchers carefully reviewed each transcript while comparing it with the original recordings to ensure transcription accuracy. The interview data were then analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analysis framework. The researchers first immersed themselves in the data through repeated reading of the transcripts, followed by systematic coding of meaningful units of information. Related codes were then grouped into potential themes, which were reviewed, refined, and clearly defined before being organized into the final thematic structure used to present the study's findings.

Results and Discussions

This section presents the findings of the study organized according to the three research questions. For each research question, the themes generated through thematic analysis are presented and interpreted in relation to existing literature and the institutional context of Tangub City Global College (TCGC). In total, five themes emerged: one theme under Research Question 1, two themes under Research Question 2, and two themes under Research Question 3. Table 1 provides a summary of the research questions and their corresponding themes. All participant quotations are presented bilingually—in the original language (a combination of Filipino, Cebuano/Bisaya, and natural code-switching as produced during the interviews) followed by an English translation in brackets—to preserve participants' authentic expressions while ensuring accessibility for an international readership. Participants are identified using the codes P1 through P10.

Table 1. Summary of Research Questions and Corresponding Themes

Research Question	Theme	Theme Title
Research Question 1: What roles and responsibilities do security personnel perform in ensuring campus safety at Tangub City Global College?	Theme 1	Strict Enforcement of Safety Protocols and Institutional Policies
Research Question 2: What operational and organizational challenges do security personnel encounter in the effective performance of their duties?	Theme 1	Difficulties in Managing Non-Compliant Students and Outsiders
	Theme 2	Institutional and Operational Challenges
Research Question 3: What institutional programs, policies, and strategies has Tangub City Global College implemented to support and enhance the effectiveness of its security personnel in maintaining campus safety?	Theme 1	Continuous Professional Development and Institutional Safety Strategies
	Theme 2	Inter-Agency Collaboration for Campus Safety

Research Question 1: What roles and responsibilities do security personnel perform in ensuring campus safety at Tangub City Global College?

Campus security personnel serve as the institution's frontline guardians of safety and order. Beyond regulating campus access, they contribute to the daily implementation of institutional policies, preventive monitoring, and the maintenance of a secure learning environment. The participants' narratives consistently revealed that their responsibilities extend beyond traditional guarding functions, highlighting the proactive nature of campus security within a government-funded higher education institution. This shared understanding gave rise to the following theme.

Theme 1: Strict Enforcement of Safety Protocols and Institutional Policies

All ten participants consistently described their primary role as the rigorous implementation of the institution's safety protocols and regulatory policies. This theme reflects the centrality of rule enforcement in participants' professional identities and daily routines. Security personnel described activities such as maintaining peace and order, checking identification cards, inspecting bags, monitoring campus entry points, and conducting regular roving patrols of their assigned areas.

Prior research shows that access control, patrol, and policy enforcement are core operational functions of campus safety, while Philippine university security offices have evolved into professional units with structured responsibilities and procedures (Moore et al., 2025; Basham, 2022). Zhang et al. (2023) similarly found that campus security personnel in Malaysian universities described access control and patrol

as foundational to their daily routines. The accounts provided by TCGC participants are consistent with this broader literature, illustrating how these responsibilities are implemented within the operational realities of a regional government-funded higher education institution.

"Ang pag-maintain ng kapayapaan at kaayosan sa ating eskwelahan... mag-check ng mga bag, mag-monitor sa mga lugar kung saan sila naka-assign... kailangan vigilant, at marami pang iba. (P1)" [Translation: "To maintain peace and order in our school... checking bags, monitoring the areas where they are assigned... [we] need to be vigilant, and many other things."]

"Safety ang mga studyante, mga faculty and staff ug mga properties sulod diri sa campus... No ID, No Entry. Dayun proper attire. (P2)" [Translation: "Safety of the students, faculty, and staff, and all properties inside the campus... No ID, No Entry. And then proper attire."]

"Mag implement sa mga rules and regulation sa taas nga among gi implement sa mga studyante... mag inspection para ma secured ang sulod. (P3)" [Translation: "To implement the rules and regulations from above that we enforce on students... conduct inspection so that the interior is secured."]

"Security personnel bahin gyud sa aning policy sa skwelahan nga mga studyante dili mo sunod ug protocol, kuhaan gyud namo ug ID... mag bantay sa mga tanang mga kaning diri sa sulod sa skwelahan, dayun mag roobing dadto. (P4)" [Translation: "Security personnel are really part of the school's policy [enforcement]—students who do not follow protocol will have their ID confiscated... we watch over everything inside the school and conduct roving patrols there."]

"Unsay order sa taas, pilit jud mi mo tuman. Labi naning mga studyanteng violator, dili jud na siya pwede pasudlon... balik balikon na unsay order sa taas nga ipa kompleto gyud ipa implementar ang balaod. (P5)" [Translation: "Whatever the orders from above, we are obliged to comply. Especially with student violators, they are not allowed entry... we continually implement whatever orders come from above to fully enforce the rules."]

The interview narratives collectively demonstrate that security personnel perceive policy implementation as the cornerstone of their professional responsibilities. P1 described the overarching objective of maintaining peace and order through vigilance, bag inspections, and continuous area monitoring, illustrating that campus security functions simultaneously as a preventive and protective mechanism intended to reduce potential security threats before they escalate. Rather than merely responding to incidents, the participant's account reflects a proactive approach in which constant visibility and surveillance serve as deterrents to misconduct while promoting an orderly campus environment.

Similarly, P2 articulated the institution's core access policy—"No ID, No Entry"—alongside requirements for proper attire, indicating that access control functions not only as an administrative procedure but also as an institutional safeguard that reinforces discipline, accountability, and compliance with campus regulations. P3 emphasized that security duties involve both the implementation of directives from institutional leadership and regular inspection of campus interiors, demonstrating that security personnel assume both reactive and preventive responsibilities in maintaining institutional order.

P4 and P5 further illuminated the authority structures within which security personnel operate. P4 noted that ID confiscation is used as a sanction for policy non-compliance and that roving patrols constitute a routine component of daily security operations, highlighting how enforcement mechanisms are integrated with preventive monitoring to promote sustained compliance. P5 expressed a strong sense of professional obligation by emphasizing strict adherence to directives issued by institutional administrators, reflecting the hierarchical nature of campus security operations where effective implementation depends on organizational coordination, clearly defined authority, and consistency in enforcement.

Taken together, these accounts demonstrate that the responsibilities of security personnel at Tangub City Global College extend beyond conventional guarding functions. Their work encompasses preventive surveillance, policy implementation, access management, continuous monitoring, and institutional representation as frontline enforcers of campus regulations. These findings reinforce the principles of community-oriented security management, which emphasize that maintaining campus safety depends not only on physical protection but also on consistent policy implementation, professional judgment, and constructive daily interactions with members of the academic community (Basham, 2020; Moore et al., 2025; Corradi et al., 2020).

Research Question 2: What operational and organizational challenges do security personnel encounter in the effective performance of their duties?

While the findings presented under Research Question 1 demonstrate that security personnel perform a broad range of preventive and regulatory responsibilities, fulfilling these responsibilities is not without challenges. Participants consistently described operational, interpersonal, and organizational constraints that influence the effectiveness of campus security operations. These challenges extend beyond

individual performance and reflect broader institutional conditions that shape how security personnel carry out their duties. Two interconnected themes emerged from the participants' narratives.

Theme 1: Difficulties in Managing Non-Compliant Students and Outsiders

The most pervasive challenge identified by participants was the management of individuals who resist institutional rules—primarily students and external visitors who refuse to comply with campus safety protocols. This theme captures the interpersonal and behavioral dimensions of security work that are not always reflected in formal job descriptions but that constitute a significant part of daily security practice.

Research has consistently identified behavioral management as one of the most demanding aspects of campus security work, particularly in settings where security personnel lack formal law enforcement authority. Adisa and Simpeh (2019) found that students' perceptions of campus safety measures often diverge significantly from those of security staff, creating friction in the enforcement of institutional policies. The TCGC context reflects these broader patterns while illustrating the additional complexity introduced by a semi-open campus where community members, not just enrolled students, regularly move through institutional spaces (Dlamini & Olanrewaju, 2021).

"Ang mga hamon lang namin dito no, minsan kasi meron talagang mga bata, mga students like you, yon yong mga hamon namin na medyo imbes na sinabihan na kung ano ang tamang gawin... yong mga estudyante nga na medyo mga matitigas ang ulo. (P1)" [Translation: "The challenges we face here—sometimes there are students, like yourselves, who instead of being told what the right thing to do is... students who are quite stubborn."]

"Naay mo sulod na mga students tas dili sila mo follow dayun atung e explain unsay ginadili. (P2)" [Translation: "There are students who attempt to enter without following the rules, and we have to explain to them what is prohibited."]

"Kana lang mga outsiders or students nga gahi kaayog mga ulo ba then kuanan sa mga balod, dili mo tuman. (P3)" [Translation: "It's really those outsiders or students who are very stubborn and, during peak crowd periods, refuse to comply."]

"Ahh mao raman gihapun kanang mga studyante nga mga badlongon ba. (P8)" [Translation: "Yes, it's still those students who are disobedient."]

"Akong giingnan na 'ug mo skwela gali imo anak subaya ang unsay requirements sa skwelahan... Karon kana imo anak naka comply na anang mga requirements sa skwelahan? Maong wanako pasudla.' (P5)" [Translation: "I told the parent: 'If your child wants to study here, they must follow the school's requirements... Has your child complied with the school's requirements? That is why I did not allow entry.'"]

The participants' narratives consistently reveal that managing non-compliant individuals constitutes one of the most demanding aspects of campus security work. P1 characterized stubborn students as a recurring challenge, illustrating that the effectiveness of campus safety measures depends not only on institutional policies but also on the willingness of students to comply voluntarily. P2 and P3 described how non-compliance becomes more difficult to manage during periods of heavy campus traffic, when large numbers of students and visitors attempt to enter simultaneously. P8 confirmed that encounters with disobedient students are not isolated incidents but a routine occupational reality.

A particularly instructive account was provided by P5, who described an encounter with a parent questioning the decision to deny entry to a student who failed to comply with institutional requirements. Rather than responding confrontationally, the participant justified the decision by referring to established school policies and emphasizing the shared responsibility of parents and students in complying with institutional regulations. This account illustrates that security personnel frequently navigate sensitive interpersonal situations requiring diplomacy, emotional regulation, and professional judgment in addition to rule enforcement. These findings resonate with Basham's (2020) observation that campus security interactions are shaped by broader social relationships and community expectations, requiring security personnel to balance institutional authority with respectful communication.

Overall, this theme demonstrates that behavioral challenges extend beyond simple policy violations. The participants' experiences suggest that effective campus security requires strong interpersonal communication, patience, conflict management, and the ability to exercise discretion while maintaining fairness and consistency (Basham, 2020; Moore et al., 2025).

Theme 2: Institutional and Operational Challenges

Beyond interpersonal difficulties, participants identified a range of systemic and operational challenges that constrain their effectiveness. These included lapses in duty coordination, theft incidents within the campus, miscommunication with administrators regarding scheduled activities, resource deficiencies—particularly the absence of adequate equipment for nighttime duties—and interpersonal conflicts among security colleagues that were identified as direct threats to safety performance.

Operational challenges in campus security—including communication gaps, resource inadequacies, and coordination failures—have been documented as significant determinants of security effectiveness. Basham (2022) highlighted that insufficient institutional support, inadequate equipment, and unclear communication channels systematically undermine the capacity of security personnel to perform their duties effectively. Such structural limitations are particularly evident in resource-constrained public institutions where organizational resources and operational support may be limited.

"Namatayan tayo na hindi naman estudyante pero nakalusot at dito namatay sa loob pero outsider siya... negligence of duty yon kaso ng security personnel. (P1)" [Translation: "We experienced a death on campus of a person who was not a student, but who had managed to gain entry and died inside—an outsider. That was a case of negligence of duty on the part of the security personnel."]

"Pareha atung naay nahitabo dira nga katung airsop unta nga gi tukod diha atung gi bangag bangagan ang oval, kato sipyat gyud tu namo. Mao ragyud tuy pinaka worst na nakuan namo gyud namo na sipyat gyud mi ato. (P6)" [Translation: "Like what happened with the airsoft structure that was supposed to be erected there—the oval area was being excavated, and that was really our biggest lapse. That was honestly the worst failure we experienced as a team."]

"Kanang ako namana gi kuan ni College President gud nga kanang magabie unta naa miy isyu ari na firearms niya sge silag follow up ambot hapit naman mahuman among kontrata di-anhi, wala. (P6)" [Translation: "The College President had been following up about the firearms issue for nighttime duties, but despite repeated follow-ups, and with our contracts nearly ending, nothing had come of it."]

"Ang una diha kay maka misunderstood sa mga kauban, then dili siya masolbad, naay mga ginagmay nga kahiubos, mao nay sinugdanan sa dili na ka-safety ang gi-duty-han. (P10)" [Translation: "The first thing that happens is misunderstanding among colleagues, and when it is not resolved, small grievances arise—and that is where the safety of the duty post begins to break down."]

The narratives reveal that institutional and operational challenges often carry consequences that extend beyond routine administrative concerns and may directly affect campus safety outcomes. P1 recounted a serious incident involving an unauthorized outsider who entered the campus and later died within the premises, formally classified as a case of negligence of duty, underscoring the critical importance of continuous vigilance and strict adherence to established security procedures. P6 described a separate incident involving construction activities that proceeded without the security team's knowledge, illustrating how inadequate administrative communication creates operational blind spots that weaken institutional oversight. The same participant also raised concerns regarding the delayed provision of appropriate equipment for nighttime security duties, reflecting broader resource constraints that may compromise personnel safety and operational readiness.

P10 introduced an often-overlooked internal dimension by emphasizing the impact of unresolved interpersonal misunderstandings among colleagues on security performance. This finding suggests that team cohesion and open communication within the security office are as critical to safety outcomes as individual vigilance, supporting Basham's (2022) argument that professional development should address interpersonal collaboration and team dynamics alongside technical competencies. Zhang et al. (2023) similarly found that inadequate communication systems and insufficient equipment were critical barriers to effective campus security.

Overall, Research Question 2 highlights that campus security is influenced by both human behavior and institutional capacity. The findings suggest that effective security management requires more than strict policy enforcement; it also depends on responsive organizational leadership, adequate logistical support, effective communication systems, and positive working relationships among security personnel. These findings reinforce previous studies emphasizing that sustainable campus safety is achieved through the interaction of individual professionalism and institutional support (Basham, 2022; Moore et al., 2025).

Research Question 3: What institutional programs, policies, and strategies has Tangub City Global College implemented to support and enhance the effectiveness of its security personnel in maintaining campus safety?

The challenges identified under Research Question 2 demonstrate that effective campus safety depends not only on the competence and commitment of security personnel but also on the institution's capacity to provide continuous organizational support. Participants consistently emphasized that Tangub City Global College (TCGC) invests in strengthening campus security through personnel development, preventive operational practices, and collaborative partnerships with external agencies. Two themes emerged from the participants' narratives.

Theme 1: Continuous Professional Development and Institutional Safety Strategies

Participants consistently described various institutional initiatives implemented by the Safety and Security Office (SSO) to strengthen the competence of security personnel while reinforcing campus-wide safety practices. These initiatives include regular security enhancement training, competency certification, periodic orientations, emergency preparedness programs, and preventive security operations. Collectively, these activities reflect the institution's commitment to maintaining a proactive rather than reactive approach to campus safety.

Previous studies emphasize that continuous professional development is essential for maintaining effective campus security. Basham (2020) argued that regular training in emergency response, conflict management, and security operations improves personnel preparedness and organizational resilience. Cabasal et al. (2023) found that systematic safety planning and continuous capability-building significantly strengthen institutional preparedness within Philippine higher education institutions. Sepadi and Chadyiwa (2025) further documented that institutional investment in safety training and capacity-building is essential for maintaining effective campus security systems.

"Tinuturan namin yong lahat na mga criminology at ISM [Industrial Security Management], ino-orient namin na what will they do during any incident or accident kung may mangyari man if there is an incident happen around the campus. (P1)" [Translation: "We teach all criminology and Industrial Security Management students, orienting them on what to do during any incident or accident that may occur on campus."]

"As far as I know, mayroon kaming annual security enhancement training. (P1)" [Translation: "As far as I know, we have an annual security enhancement training."]

"Una kanang ilahang kuan ni College President kanang iyahang NC2, NC3 run iyang gipa kuan diha sa amo a mga security guard. (P6)" [Translation: "First, there was the NC2 and NC3 [National Certificate] training that the College President arranged for us security guards."]

"Kada three month tali kana mag orientation gyud diri kanang mga workshop ba. (P8)" [Translation: "Every three months, we attend orientations and workshops here."]

"Lagi sila, ang mga security, laging nagrorobing around the school para sa ma secure namin ang ating eskwelahan... conduct inspection, random check of the areas. (P1)" [Translation: "The security personnel always conduct roving patrols around the school to secure the campus... they conduct inspections and random checks of all areas."]

P1 explained that the Safety and Security Office conducts orientations for Criminology and Industrial Security Management students regarding emergency preparedness and appropriate responses during campus incidents, extending the office's mandate beyond enforcement to promote safety awareness among future professionals. The same participant confirmed the institution's annual Security Enhancement Training, indicating that professional development is embedded within the operational culture of the SSO. P6 highlighted the provision of National Certificate (NC II and NC III) competency training facilitated by the College President, reflecting institutional investment in raising the professional qualifications of security personnel beyond minimum employment requirements. P8 described quarterly orientations and workshops, reflecting a regular training rhythm that ensures personnel remain current on procedural expectations. The consistent emphasis on roving patrols and random inspections as core daily practice reflects the institution's primary operational deterrence strategy.

Overall, the findings indicate that TCGC strengthens campus safety by integrating continuous professional development with preventive operational strategies. These initiatives not only enhance the competencies of security personnel but also cultivate a culture of preparedness and shared responsibility for campus safety across the institution.

Theme 2: Inter-Agency Collaboration for Campus Safety

Beyond strengthening its internal capacity, participants consistently described collaboration with external government agencies as another essential strategy for maintaining campus safety. These partnerships provide specialized expertise, additional personnel, and legal authority that complement the capabilities of the institution's Safety and Security Office, particularly during emergencies and major campus activities.

The literature consistently recognizes inter-agency collaboration as a critical component of effective campus security systems. Basham (2020) emphasized that community policing relies on sustained partnerships among educational institutions, law enforcement agencies, emergency responders, and local government units. Similarly, Philippine studies have shown that collaborative safety planning enhances institutional resilience by integrating specialized expertise from multiple organizations (Cabasal et al., 2023; Tejano, 2023).

"Ang safety and security office po ay nag collab sa Philippine National Police, sa Bureau of Fire Protection, sa CDRMO or City Disaster Risk Reduction Management Office, at Red-Cross Council. Syempre, always

lang makipag-meet sa kanila, conduct a meeting, what will we do, what is the best for that. (P1) [Translation: "The Safety and Security Office collaborate with the Philippine National Police, the Bureau of Fire Protection, the CDRMO or City Disaster Risk Reduction Management Office, and the Red Cross Council. Of course, we always meet with them, conduct meetings, discuss what we will do, and determine the best course of action."]

"Mo rescue manang CPAT namo diri ug naay mga activity... nay pulis o PNP diri motabang namo diri og assist. (P4) [Translation: "CPAT assists us here during activities... the police or PNP come to help and assist us here."]

"Ug naay mga daotan nga elemento nga medyo mamatikdan, report sa pulis kay sila may authority na naay police authority. (P5) [Translation: "If dangerous elements are detected, we report to the police because they have the police authority to act on it."]

"Kanang katung event gyud na dako dako ari naa gyud miy mga PNP gyud na. PNP personnel gyud na gi deploy ari, assist sa amo a. (P6) [Translation: "During major events held here, PNP personnel are deployed to assist us."]

"Madaling communication... ug unsay mga problema anagayan mi manawag sa unsay angay adtoon. (P9) [Translation: "Communication is easy... if there are problems, we call whoever is appropriate to address them."]

P1 described regular coordination meetings involving the Philippine National Police, Bureau of Fire Protection, City Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office, and the Philippine Red Cross, demonstrating that collaboration encompasses joint planning and preparedness activities before incidents occur. P4 and P6 confirmed that agencies such as CPAT and the PNP provide operational support during major institutional activities, enabling the institution to augment its internal security workforce during periods of heightened demand. P5's account demonstrates appropriate professional judgment: recognizing the legal limitations of campus security personnel, participants appropriately refer serious security concerns to the PNP. P9 emphasized accessible communication channels between the SSO and partner agencies, facilitating timely coordination and rapid emergency response.

Taken together, the findings reveal that Tuguegarao City Global College strengthens campus safety through two complementary mechanisms: continuous institutional investment in the professional development of its security personnel and sustained collaboration with external government agencies and community organizations. While internal initiatives enhance personnel competence and preventive security practices, inter-agency partnerships broaden the institution's operational capacity by providing specialized expertise, additional resources, and coordinated emergency response. These complementary approaches reflect the principles of community policing, which emphasize that sustainable campus safety is achieved through organizational preparedness, shared responsibility, and collaborative governance rather than relying solely on the efforts of individual security personnel (Basham, 2020; Moore et al., 2025; Dlamini & Olanrewaju, 2021).

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles governing qualitative research involving human participants and complied with the institutional research ethics guidelines of Tuguegarao City Global College (TCGC). The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the TCGC Research Ethics Committee prior to data collection, ensuring that the research adhered to established ethical standards for studies involving human participants. In addition to institutional ethics clearance, formal administrative permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Head of the Safety and Security Office of TCGC. All prospective participants were provided with a clear explanation of the study's objectives, research procedures, expected duration, potential risks and benefits, and the intended use of the data. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant before the interviews commenced. Participation was entirely voluntary, and participants were informed that they could decline to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any stage without penalty or adverse consequences. The researchers maintained strict standards of confidentiality and anonymity throughout the research process. To protect participants' identities, all interview transcripts and quotations were anonymized using participant codes (P1–P10) instead of personal names or official positions. Audio recordings, interview transcripts, and related research documents were securely stored and were accessible only to the research team. The collected data were used exclusively for academic and research purposes and were not disclosed to institutional administrators or any third party in a manner that could identify individual participants. Throughout the interviews, the researchers adopted a respectful, non-coercive, and non-judgmental approach to minimize psychological discomfort and encourage participants to share their experiences freely. The researchers faithfully represented participants' narratives during transcription, translation, and reporting to preserve the

authenticity and integrity of their lived experiences while ensuring accessibility for an international readership.

Conclusion

This study investigated the roles, challenges, and institutional responses of security personnel at Tangub City Global College, providing qualitative insights into campus safety management within a regional government-funded higher education institution in the Philippines. Using thematic analysis, five themes emerged across the three research questions: (1) Strict Enforcement of Safety Protocols and Institutional Policies; (2) Difficulties in Managing Non-Compliant Students and Outsiders; (3) Institutional and Operational Challenges; (4) Continuous Professional Development and Institutional Safety Strategies; and (5) Inter-Agency Collaboration for Campus Safety. Together, these themes demonstrate that campus safety is sustained through the interaction of frontline security practices, organizational support, and collaborative governance. The findings reveal that TCGC security personnel perform responsibilities that extend beyond routine surveillance and policy enforcement. Their work requires continuous vigilance, situational awareness, conflict management, effective communication, and sound professional judgment while interacting with students, employees, visitors, and community members within a semi-open campus environment. At the same time, participants identified operational realities—including non-compliance with institutional policies, communication gaps, resource limitations, and occasional interpersonal conflicts—that influence the effectiveness of campus security operations. These findings illustrate that campus safety is shaped not only by the competence of individual security personnel but also by the organizational systems, institutional resources, and administrative support that enable them to perform their duties effectively. The study further demonstrates that Tangub City Global College adopts a comprehensive institutional approach to campus safety by combining continuous professional development with collaborative partnerships involving government agencies and community organizations. Regular enhancement training, competency certification through National Certificate (NC II and NC III) programs, periodic orientations and workshops, preventive patrol operations, and coordinated partnerships with agencies such as the Philippine National Police, Bureau of Fire Protection, City Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office, City Peacemakers Asenso Team, and the Philippine Red Cross collectively strengthen the institution's capacity to prevent, prepare for, and respond to campus security concerns. These complementary mechanisms reinforce the principle that campus safety is a shared institutional responsibility rather than the sole obligation of security personnel. This study contributes to the limited body of qualitative research examining the lived experiences of campus security personnel in Philippine higher education institutions, particularly within regional government-funded colleges where institutional resources and organizational contexts differ from those commonly represented in international literature. By foregrounding the perspectives of security personnel, the study provides context-specific evidence that may inform institutional policy development, professional capacity-building initiatives, and collaborative campus safety programs in comparable higher education settings. Future research should build on this study's findings by adopting broader and more diverse methodological approaches to campus safety in Philippine higher education. Quantitative studies assessing campus safety perceptions across multiple institutions within Region X and neighboring regions would enable comparative analysis and facilitate the development of region-specific safety frameworks. Mixed-methods investigations that integrate the perspectives of students, faculty members, and administrators alongside security personnel would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how campus safety is experienced and negotiated across stakeholder groups. Longitudinal studies examining how community policing models and inter-agency collaboration initiatives affect student safety perceptions and incident rates over time would generate particularly valuable evidence for institutional policy development. Evaluative research assessing the long-term outcomes of National Certificate training programs on security personnel performance and campus safety indicators would likewise contribute meaningfully to evidence-based professional development planning in the sector.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed to enhance campus safety management and guide future research. Tangub City Global College is encouraged to sustain its commitment to safety by continuously investing in the training and professional development of security personnel, while addressing resource needs such as adequate equipment and clearly defined emergency protocols. The institution should also strengthen partnerships with external agencies, including the Philippine National Police (PNP), Bureau of Fire Protection (BFP), City Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (CDRRMO), City Peacemakers Asenso Team (CPAT), and the Philippine Red Cross, through formal agreements to ensure effective coordination during emergencies. College administrators are encouraged to improve communication with the Safety and Security Office and to establish comprehensive standard

operating procedures for routine operations, campus events, and emergency situations. Security personnel should maintain a balance between strict policy enforcement and respectful engagement with stakeholders, while continuing to enhance teamwork and participate in professional development programs. Finally, future researchers are encouraged to expand the scope of the study by including multiple stakeholders, applying comparative or mixed methods approaches, and evaluating the effectiveness of safety programs and policies, including longitudinal studies to support continuous improvement in campus safety management.

References

- Adisa, S., & Simpeh, F. (2019). Student perceptions of the safety and security risk of on-campus student housing facilities. In *2019 IEEE Asia-Pacific Conference on Computer Science and Data Engineering (CSDE)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSDE48274.2019.9162378>
- Azevedo, V., Nunes, L. M., & Sani, A. I. (2022). Is campus a place of (in)security and crime? Perceptions and predictors among higher education students. *European Journal of Investigation in Health Psychology and Education*, 12(2), 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe12020015>
- Basham, S. L. (2020). Campus law enforcement: The relationship between emergency preparedness and community policing. *Policing: An International Journal*, 43(5), 741-753. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-01-2020-0010>
- Basham, S. L. (2022). Community policing and the organizational structure of campus law enforcement agencies. *Policing: An International Journal*, 45(2), 186-200. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-07-2021-0096>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Cabasal, M. C., Lusiniara, M. T., & Alumia, A. B. (2023). Safety, security, and disaster preparedness plan of AIMS as perceived by internal stakeholders: Towards the enhancement of institutional safety and security plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Applied Business and Education Research*, 4(12), 4430-4459. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.04.12.21>
- Corradi, A., Sanders, C. B., & Popham, J. (2020). "But I'm standing inside right now and I need help": Security projects and the perceptions of campus security. *Qualitative Criminology*, 9(1), 8-30. <https://doi.org/10.21428/88deo4a1.0aof9aa6>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986218779913>
- Dlamini, N., & Olanrewaju, O. A. (2021). An investigation into campus safety and security. *International Journal of Education and Management Engineering*, 11(3), 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.46254/an11.20210045>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0000187585015001001>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0000187585015001001>
- Moore, P., Diliberti, M. K., Simmons, I., Schwartz, H. L., & Jackson, B. A. (2025). *Safety and security at institutions of higher education: Understanding trends, practices, and future needs*. RAND Corporation. <https://doi.org/10.7249/rra2999-1>
- Sepadi, M. M., & Chadyiwa, M. (2025). Health and safety challenges in South African universities: A qualitative review of campus risks and institutional responses. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 22(7), 989. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22070989>
- Simpeh, F., & Adisa, S. (2021). Evaluation of on-campus student housing facilities security and safety performance. *Facilities*, 39(7/8), 470-487. <https://doi.org/10.1108/F-04-2020-0051>
- Tejano, A. C. (2023). Assessment on the campus security policies among higher education institutions (HEIs) in the City of Koronadal, South Cotabato. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 153(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp10013911220235798>
- Zhang, R., Khoo, T. J., Lei, H., Jiang, X., & Ha, C. Y. (2023). Application of the third generation Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design on university campuses. *Journal of Advanced Research in Applied Sciences and Engineering Technology*, 33(1), 406-423. <https://doi.org/10.37934/araset.33.1.406423>