

Crime Prevention and Response Capacities of Security Guards in Urban Commercial Hubs: Insights from Philippine Urban Commercial Hubs

Syrenzo R. Sicuan^{*1}, John Aaron M. Dizon², Joenico M. Sibayan³,
Christine Mae C. Fronda⁴, Clarissa V. Bocobo⁵

¹College of General and Teacher Education, Pangasinan State University – Binmaley Campus,
Binmaley, Pangasinan, Philippines

^{2,3,4,5}College of Criminal Justice Education, Pangasinan State University – Binmaley Campus,
Binmaley, Pangasinan, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: ssicuan.binmaley@psu.edu.ph

Date received: May 19, 2025

Date revised: June 10, 2025

Date accepted: July 3, 2025

Originality: 97%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 3%

Recommended citation:

Sicuan, S., Dizon, J.A., Sibayan, J., Fronda, C.M., & Bocobo, C. (2025). Crime prevention and response capacities of security guards in urban commercial hubs: Insights from Philippine urban commercial hubs. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(8), 142-151. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.425>

Abstract. This study evaluated the capability of security guards in implementing crime prevention and violence response measures in commercial establishments across Urdaneta and Dagupan Cities, Pangasinan, Philippines. Guided by a quantitative-descriptive correlational design, the research involved 180 security personnel as respondents. Using structured questionnaires and Pearson correlation analysis, the study assessed awareness and implementation levels in three core areas: crime prevention, response to violence, and the use of security technologies. Findings revealed that security guards were “Very Aware” of crime prevention strategies ($M = 4.35$) and violence response protocols ($M = 4.24$), and “Aware” of available security technologies ($M = 4.03$). Implementation levels were consistently rated as “Always,” with the highest in incident response and reporting ($M = 4.56$), followed by monitoring and surveillance ($M = 4.50$), and collaboration with law enforcement agencies ($M = 4.49$). A significant negative correlation was found between gender and awareness of violence response protocols, and between years of experience and collaboration with law enforcement agencies. These results suggest the need for gender-responsive training and sustained engagement strategies tailored to more experienced security personnel. The findings highlight the operational competence of security guards in routine tasks, while also identifying gaps in crowd control, the use of advanced technology, and inter-agency coordination. The study recommends the development of enhanced, inclusive, and technology-integrated training programs further to professionalize private security services in urban commercial settings.

Keywords: Security personnel; Crime prevention; Violence response; Security implementation; Commercial establishments.

1.0 Introduction

Security guards have become central figures in maintaining order and safety within commercial establishments, especially in urban centers where business activity is concentrated and crime risks are high. Globally, the role of private security has expanded to meet growing demands in both public and private spaces, yet persistent gaps remain in terms of preparedness, technological integration, and gender sensitivity in their training and deployment (Fagel, Fennelly, & Perry, 2020; Grossberger, 2021). Recent evidence has shown that their effectiveness

is deeply tied to the quality of training, communication capabilities, and their ability to utilize surveillance technologies and coordinate with law enforcement (Attan et al., 2018; Bowen, Anthony, & Sumner, 2022).

In the Philippine context, the function of private security personnel is governed under Republic Act No. 5487, also known as the Private Security Agency Law, which mandates their role in maintaining peace and order. Despite this, there is uneven implementation of standardized training programs, particularly outside Metro Manila. Ayeo-eo (2023) noted a lack of sustained professional development, which has led to reduced readiness in actual incident scenarios. Barte et al. (2022) similarly found that security personnel assigned to institutional environments often lacked sufficient qualifications and preparedness. In many mid-sized cities such as Urdaneta and Dagupan in Pangasinan, these problems persist but remain underexamined in academic literature. While larger urban areas have seen investments in intelligent surveillance systems, many provincial cities still rely heavily on manual operations with minimal use of data-driven tools (de Bever et al., 2019; McCrie & Lee, 2023).

Globally, research shows that crimes tend to cluster around commercial properties. Bowen et al. (2022) reported that certain business types are disproportionately exposed to violent incidents, especially when security presence is minimal or poorly trained. Meanwhile, Franklin et al. (2020) emphasized the need for trauma-informed training in response to violent and sensitive incidents, a component often lacking in the training modules of many Filipino security guards. Shirley P. Ayeo-eo (2023) and Pauya and Flores (2021) observed that gender-responsive measures are still limited, with few agencies offering differentiated training that accounts for the gendered dynamics of crime response and threat perception. These gaps are even more visible in secondary cities, where resource limitations and logistical constraints restrict innovation and continuous training.

In Dagupan and Urdaneta Cities, the situation reflects these national and global issues on a smaller scale. Despite being economically active areas, there is limited integration of security analytics, low adoption of advanced monitoring systems, and a scarcity of gender-sensitive training programs. Security guards often remain focused on physical patrols and manual logs, and incident escalation protocols frequently suffer from delays or a lack of coordination with police (Gordon, 2020; Mina et al., 2021). The Philippine National Police Supervisory Office for Security and Investigation Agencies (PNP-SOSIA) mandates basic training, but there is no publicly accessible data showing compliance rates among provincial agencies. Moreover, no clear benchmarks exist for evaluating post-training effectiveness or technological readiness.

Specifically, the objectives of this study are to: (1) describe the demographic profile of security guards in terms of age, gender, experience, educational attainment, and training; (2) assess their level of awareness regarding crime prevention, violence response, and security technologies; (3) evaluate the implementation of these measures in the areas of monitoring, incident response, and coordination with law enforcement; (4) examine whether the profile variables are significantly related to awareness; and (5) determine whether the same variables are significantly related to the level of implementation. In doing so, this study contributes to ongoing efforts to professionalize private security services through inclusive, tech-integrated, and evidence-based training programs tailored to local contexts.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study used a quantitative descriptive-correlational design. It focused on measuring awareness and implementation levels of security guards and examining how those relate to their age, gender, years of experience, educational attainment, and training. This approach enabled structured data collection and statistical analysis, which aligned with the study's objective of identifying relationships between measurable variables.

2.2 Research Locale

The study was conducted in selected commercial establishments located in Urdaneta City and Dagupan City, two major urban centers in Pangasinan, Philippines. These cities serve as key commercial hubs in the region, hosting a variety of business establishments, including supermarkets, fast food chains, and large retail stores such as CSI. The presence of high foot traffic and diverse customer profiles in these locations makes them strategic sites for examining the operational practices of security guards. These settings provided an ideal context to assess the guards' awareness, training, and implementation of crime prevention and violence response measures in real-world, high-activity environments.

2.3 Research Participants

The study involved 180 security guards from commercial establishments located in Urdaneta City and Dagupan City. These establishments were purposively selected based on three criteria: regular daily operations, high foot traffic, and presence of deployed security personnel. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure representativeness. The strata were categorized based on the size of the establishment (small, medium, and large) and the guards' years of experience (0–2 years, 3–5 years, and more than 5 years). From these strata, participants were randomly selected to maintain demographic and experiential diversity.

2.4 Research Instrument

A structured questionnaire was employed to collect data. The instrument consisted of three main parts: (1) demographic profile, (2) level of awareness regarding crime prevention, violence response, and security technologies, and (3) level of implementation in terms of monitoring and surveillance, incident response, and collaboration with law enforcement. All perception-based items utilized a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). The questionnaire was constructed using reference materials, including security manuals and previous empirical studies in the field. Although no pilot testing was conducted, the instrument underwent content validation by three subject matter experts in security studies and criminology. Based on the validation and subsequent refinements, the instrument achieved a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of 0.82, indicating good internal consistency.

2.5 Data Gathering Procedure

Data collection followed a systematic process. The researcher coordinated with establishment managers and distributed paper questionnaires during guard shifts. Each respondent was briefed before answering. The researcher remained on site to collect completed forms and verify their completeness. All responses were manually reviewed and encoded.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

All participants gave informed consent. Their responses were anonymous, and no personal identifiers were collected. Data were handled by the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Participation was voluntary, and respondents could opt out at any time. The researcher adhered to ethical practices to minimize risk and bias.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Demographic Profile of the Security Guards

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including their age, gender, years of experience as security guards, educational attainment, and type of training they underwent.

Table 1. *Demographic Profile of the Security Guards*

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Below 25 years old	8	4.40
	25–34 years old	71	39.40
	35–44 years old	57	31.70
	45–54 years old	35	19.40
	55 years old and above	9	5.00
Gender	Male	150	83.30
	Female	28	15.60
	Prefer not to say	2	1.10
Years of Experience as a Security Guard	Less than 1 year	17	9.40
	1–5 years	70	38.90
	6–10 years	54	30.00
	11–15 years	18	10.00
	More than 15 years	21	11.70
Educational Attainment	Elementary Graduate	1	0.60
	High School Graduate	98	54.40
	College Undergraduate	49	27.20
	College Graduate	30	16.70
	Postgraduate	2	1.10
Type of Training Undergone	Basic Security Guard Training	102	56.70
	Advanced Security Training	29	16.10
	Specialized Training	11	6.10
	On-the-job Training	9	5.00
	More than Two Types of Training	29	16.10

Table 1 presents the distribution of respondents by age, gender, years of experience as a security guard, educational attainment, and type of training received. A total of 180 security guards participated in the study from commercial establishments in Urdaneta City and Dagupan City. In terms of age, the majority of respondents were aged 25–34 years old (71, or 39.4%), followed by those aged 35–44 years old (57, or 31.7%), and then those aged 45–54 years old (35, or 19.4%). The lowest representation came from those below 25 years old (8 or 4.4%) and 55 years old and above (9 or 5.0%). Regarding gender, 150 of the respondents were male (83.3%), 28 were female (15.6%), and 2 preferred not to disclose their gender (1.1%). For years of experience, 1–5 years was the most common bracket (70 or 38.9%), followed by 6–10 years (54 or 30.0%). A smaller portion had more than 15 years of experience (21 or 11.7%), 11–15 years (18 or 10.0%), and less than 1 year (17 or 9.4%). As for educational attainment, the majority were high school graduates (98, or 54.4%), followed by college undergraduates (49, or 27.2%), college graduates (30, or 16.7%), with minimal representation from elementary graduates (1, or 0.6%) and postgraduates (2, or 1.1%).

In terms of training, more than half (102 or 56.7%) had undergone Basic Security Guard Training, while Advanced Security Training and more than two types of training were both reported by 29 respondents (16.1% each). A smaller proportion had Specialized Training (11 or 6.1%) or on-the-job training only (9 or 5.0%). The demographic profile indicates that most security guards were in their early to mid-career stages, predominantly aged between 25 and 44 years old, suggesting a physically capable and professionally active workforce. The heavy concentration of male respondents reflects the gendered nature of the security industry, which often favors males due to the physical demands of the role (Noronha et al., 2018). The data also show that a significant portion had 1–10 years of experience, indicating practical exposure, yet relatively few had reached the 15-year mark. This implies either high turnover or limited long-term career progression in the field – an issue also echoed in related studies on the precariousness of security employment (Noronha et al., 2018; Pauya & Flores, 2021).

Educational attainment was primarily limited to the high school level, although a fair share had at least some college education. This aligns with findings from Ayeeo (2023), who emphasized that while most guards meet minimum educational requirements, many lack higher-level training that could strengthen their decision-making and procedural judgment in high-risk situations. On training, the fact that over half had only undergone basic training raises concerns about readiness in dealing with complex threats or emergencies. Only a minority had access to specialized or advanced training, which may limit their awareness and implementation of critical security protocols (Fagel et al., 2019). This supports earlier claims that security guards are often under-equipped for modern challenges, particularly those involving technology or public safety coordination (Grossberger, 2021; Sennewald & Baillie, 2021). These findings underscore the need for more inclusive and advanced training programs, enhanced retention strategies for experienced personnel, and expanded access to continuing education opportunities. As shown in studies by McCrie and Lee (2023), the combination of experience and advanced training is essential for ensuring effective crime prevention and response. Improving these aspects directly impacts the level of awareness and implementation of security measures, key focus areas in the succeeding parts of this study.

3.2 Level of Awareness of Security Guards

This section presents the data on the respondents' level of awareness regarding crime prevention measures, violence response protocols, and the security technologies available in their respective commercial establishments. The 180 security guards who participated in the study were primarily male (83.3%) and aged 25–44, indicating a physically active workforce in their early to mid-career stages. Most had 1–10 years of experience, suggesting moderate field exposure but limited long-term retention. Educational attainment was primarily at the high school level (54.4%), with some exposure to college education. Over half (56.7%) had completed only Basic Security Guard Training, while a much smaller portion received advanced or specialized instruction. These patterns reflect a workforce with foundational readiness but limited access to advanced skills, which may impact how effectively they perform crime prevention and violence response tasks. The findings highlight gaps in professional development and training that could compromise the effectiveness of security guards in addressing more complex threats, particularly those involving technology or coordinated responses.

Table 2. *Level of Awareness of Security Guards in terms of Crime Prevention Measures*

No.	Crime Prevention Measures	NA	SA	MA	A	VA
1	I am aware of the importance of patrolling to deter criminal activities.	1 0.60	4 2.20	6 3.30	79 43.90	90 50.00
2	I understand the procedures for preventing unauthorized access to restricted areas.	3 1.70	5 2.80	4 2.20	68 37.80	100 55.60
3	I am familiar with the process of identifying and reporting suspicious behavior.	1 0.60	7 3.90	8 4.40	63 35.00	101 56.10
4	I know the steps to follow during emergency lockdowns.	1 0.60	9 5.00	9 5.00	55 30.60	106 58.90
5	I am aware of crowd control techniques during high-traffic periods.	7 3.90	11 6.10	18 10.00	95 52.80	49 27.20
6	I understand how to use deterrent strategies, such as visible security presence.	2 1.10	10 5.60	16 8.90	97 53.90	55 30.60
7	I know how to document and report minor security incidents.	2 1.10	5 2.80	14 7.80	63 35.00	96 53.30
8	I am familiar with the protocols for conducting random inspections.	0 0.00	4 2.20	8 4.40	53 29.40	115 63.90
9	I understand how to coordinate with other staff for crime prevention.	2 1.10	5 2.80	7 3.90	61 33.90	105 58.30
10	I am aware of the importance of maintaining a professional demeanor.	4 2.20	3 1.70	12 6.70	53 29.40	108 60.00
Average Weighted Mean		4.35 Very Aware				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NA - Not Aware); 1.81-2.60 (SA - Slightly Aware); 2.61-3.40 (MA - Moderately Aware); 3.41-4.20 (A - Aware); 4.21-5.00 (VA - Very Aware)

The 180 security guards in the study reported a high level of awareness of violence response protocols, with an overall average weighted mean of 4.24, classified as Very Aware. Most respondents showed strong understanding of procedures involving law enforcement, bystander safety, and securing areas after violent incidents. However, fewer reported being Very Aware of how to de-escalate aggressive behavior (29.4%) or use defensive equipment properly (36.1%), pointing to weaknesses in frontline readiness. Moderate awareness levels were also common in areas like recognizing signs of escalating conflict and assisting victims, suggesting partial preparedness in these early-response actions. While the results indicate that guards are generally familiar with core violence response procedures, they reveal a gap in skills that require direct engagement, judgment, or physical intervention. These gaps likely result from a lack of hands-on or scenario-based training. To enhance real-time effectiveness, guards may require targeted instruction in de-escalation, threat recognition, and the use of tactical equipment. These findings support previous research calling for upgraded training to match the operational demands faced in commercial settings.

Table 3. *Level of Awareness of Security Guards in terms of Violence Response Protocols*

No.	Violence Response Protocols	NA	SA	MA	A	VA
1	I know how to de-escalate situations involving aggressive individuals.	2 1.10	11 6.10	24 13.30	90 50.00	53 29.40
2	I am familiar with the protocol for responding to physical altercations.	0 0.00	7 3.90	21 11.70	85 47.20	67 37.20
3	I understand the steps to take when reporting incidents of violence to management.	0 0.00	10 5.60	12 6.70	80 44.40	78 43.30
4	I am aware of the procedures for ensuring the safety of bystanders during violent incidents.	4 2.20	4 2.20	14 7.80	62 34.40	96 53.30
5	I know the proper use of defensive equipment in handling violent situations.	2 1.10	11 6.10	15 8.30	87 48.30	65 36.10
6	I understand the protocol for involving law enforcement during violent emergencies.	4 2.20	5 2.80	9 5.00	65 36.10	97 53.90
7	I am familiar with the steps to assist victims of violence while maintaining personal safety.	1 0.60	7 3.90	14 7.80	94 52.20	64 35.60
8	I know how to recognize signs of escalating conflict before it becomes violent.	2 1.10	6 3.30	17 9.40	68 37.8	87 48.30
9	I understand how to secure the area after a violent incident has occurred.	0 0.00	9 5.00	13 7.20	61 33.90	97 53.90
10	I am aware of the importance of documenting violent incidents for legal or organizational purposes.	6 3.30	7 3.90	13 7.20	58 32.20	96 53.30
Average Weighted Mean		4.24 Very Aware				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NA - Not Aware); 1.81-2.60 (SA - Slightly Aware); 2.61-3.40 (MA - Moderately Aware); 3.41-4.20 (A - Aware); 4.21-5.00 (VA - Very Aware)

The 180 security guards demonstrated an overall awareness level of 4.03 regarding security technologies,

categorized as 'Aware'. Most respondents reported confidence in using basic tools, such as communication devices, biometric systems, and panic buttons, with nearly 90% rating themselves as Aware or Very Aware in using radios. However, lower awareness was observed in areas involving system integration and temporary security setups, where fewer than 30% marked themselves as Very Aware. Troubleshooting equipment and retrieving digital log data also received weaker responses, highlighting gaps in technical competence. These results suggest that while guards can handle routine security technologies, they lack training in more advanced or specialized functions. This limitation may affect response time and overall system reliability in high-risk or complex environments. The findings align with previous research that highlights the need for improved technical training. Enhancing skills in equipment maintenance, system integration, and digital monitoring can help guards manage tech-based threats more effectively and reduce their reliance on external support.

Table 4. Level of Awareness of Security Guards in terms of Security Technologies Available in their Establishments

No.	Security Technologies Available In Their Establishments	NA	SA	MA	A	VA
1	I understand how to operate surveillance cameras in the establishment.	6	9	28	63	74
		3.30	5.00	15.60	35.00	41.10
2	I am aware of the functionalities of alarm systems installed in the establishment.	6	3	22	89	60
		3.30	1.70	12.20	49.40	33.30
3	I know how to use communication devices, such as radios, effectively.	2	3	16	79	80
		1.10	1.70	8.90	43.90	44.40
4	I am familiar with biometric systems or other advanced security tools.	3	11	33	49	84
		1.70	6.10	18.30	27.20	46.70
5	I understand how to monitor and retrieve data from digital security logs.	7	24	29	49	71
		3.90	13.30	16.10	27.20	39.40
6	I am aware of how to troubleshoot basic issues with security equipment.	15	24	19	49	73
		8.30	13.30	10.60	27.20	40.60
7	I know how to use panic buttons or emergency communication systems.	3	11	15	67	84
		1.70	6.10	8.30	37.20	46.70
8	I understand how to set up and monitor temporary security technologies during special events.	12	11	24	82	51
		6.70	6.10	13.30	45.60	28.30
9	I am familiar with the integration of different security technologies.	5	16	28	81	50
		2.80	8.90	15.60	45.00	27.80
10	I am aware of the importance of regular maintenance and updates for security equipment.	5	6	13	80	76
		2.80	3.30	7.20	44.40	42.20
Average Weighted Mean		4.03 Aware				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NA - Not Aware); 1.81-2.60 (SA - Slightly Aware); 2.61-3.40 (MA - Moderately Aware); 3.41-4.20 (A - Aware); 4.21-5.00 (VA - Very Aware)

The summary of awareness levels across three areas—crime prevention, violence response, and security technologies—shows that security guards had an overall rating of 4.21, classified as Very Aware. They scored highest in crime prevention (4.35), followed by violence response (4.24), reflecting a solid familiarity with standard protocols such as patrolling, securing areas, and coordinating with law enforcement. Awareness of security technologies was the lowest (4.03), although it was still categorized as 'Aware'. This confirms that while guards are confident with basic tools like radios and cameras, they are less familiar with advanced or integrated systems. The results suggest that daily exposure to routine security tasks builds stronger awareness, but limited training in technical areas leaves gaps. This mismatch may weaken response capabilities during system-based or tech-related incidents. Overall, the guards demonstrate a strong foundation in traditional security roles; however, the findings highlight a need for targeted training in modern security technologies to keep pace with evolving threats and enhance workplace readiness.

Table 5. Summary of the Level of Awareness of Security Guards

Variables	AWM	Interpretation
Crime Prevention Measures	4.35	Very Aware
Violence Response Protocols	4.24	Very Aware
Security Technologies Available In Their Establishments	4.03	Aware
Mean	4.21	Very Aware

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (NA - Not Aware); 1.81-2.60 (SA - Slightly Aware); 2.61-3.40 (MA - Moderately Aware); 3.41-4.20 (A - Aware); 4.21-5.00 (VA - Very Aware)

3.3 Level of Implementation of Crime Prevention and Violence Response Measures by Security Guards

This section presents the data on how security guards implement crime prevention and violence response measures in their respective establishments. It focuses on three key operational areas: monitoring and surveillance, incident response and reporting, and collaboration with law enforcement agencies.

Table 6. Level of Implementation of Crime Prevention and Violence Response Measures by Security Guards in terms of Monitoring and Surveillance

No.	Monitoring and Surveillance	N	R	S	O	A
1	I conduct regular patrols to monitor the premises.	1	1	5	53	120
		0.60	0.60	2.80	29.40	66.70
2	I use surveillance cameras to observe and document activities.	13	2	29	38	98
		7.20	1.10	16.10	21.10	54.40
3	I check for suspicious behavior during my monitoring duties.	0	0	9	39	132
		0.00	0.00	5.00	21.70	73.30
4	I inspect access points to ensure they are secure.	1	3	6	57	113
		0.60	1.70	3.30	31.70	62.80
5	I conduct random checks on restricted areas for unauthorized access.	1	5	15	48	111
		0.60	2.80	8.30	26.70	61.70
6	I monitor high-traffic areas during peak hours.	2	4	14	45	115
		1.10	2.20	7.80	25.00	63.90
7	I maintain accurate records of all surveillance activities.	2	3	13	41	121
		1.10	1.70	7.20	22.80	67.20
8	I report malfunctions or issues with surveillance equipment immediately.	2	0	6	32	140
		1.10	0.00	3.30	17.80	77.80
9	I use communication devices effectively while monitoring.	4	5	12	56	103
		2.20	2.80	6.70	31.10	57.20
10	I proactively address security risks identified during surveillance.	4	0	11	54	111
		2.20	0.00	6.10	30.00	61.70
Average Weighted Mean		4.50 Always				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (N - Never); 1.81-2.60 (R - Rarely); 2.61-3.40 (S - Sometimes); 3.41-4.20 (O - Often); 4.21-5.00 (A - Always)

Security guards consistently performed monitoring and surveillance tasks, with an overall average rating of 4.50, indicating an "Always" level of performance. The most frequent actions included reporting surveillance equipment issues (77.8%), checking for suspicious behavior (73.3%), and maintaining activity records (67.2%). Regular patrols and inspections of access points were also widely practiced. However, camera use showed more variability, with only 54.4% marking Always and a notable portion selecting lower frequency options, likely due to equipment or access limitations. Communication during monitoring and addressing risks also received slightly lower ratings, though still positive. These results demonstrate that guards consistently perform foundational surveillance duties and maintain accountability in routine tasks. However, gaps in technology access and support may limit the consistency of certain practices. The findings suggest the need for better equipment availability, role-specific camera access, and refresher training to strengthen surveillance performance across all areas.

Table 7. Level of Implementation of Crime Prevention and Violence Response Measures by Security Guards in terms of Incident Response and Reporting

No.	Incident Response and Reporting	N	R	S	O	A
1	I respond promptly to security incidents within the establishment	0	1	11	52	116
		0.00	0.60	6.10	28.90	64.40
2	I follow established protocols when handling security breaches.	2	0	6	41	131
		1.10	0.00	3.30	22.80	72.80
3	I ensure the safety of employees and patrons during incidents.	0	1	6	45	128
		0.00	0.60	3.30	25.00	71.10
4	I document all incidents thoroughly and accurately.	1	1	8	43	127
		0.60	0.60	4.40	23.90	70.60
5	I report incidents to management or supervisors without delay.	2	1	9	51	117
		1.10	0.60	5.00	28.30	65.00
6	I secure the area after an incident to prevent further risks.	0	2	9	39	130
		0.00	1.10	5.00	21.70	72.20
7	I assist in evacuating individuals during emergencies.	4	0	13	36	127
		2.20	0.00	7.20	20.00	70.60
8	I collaborate with first responders when they arrive on the scene.	1	4	12	38	125
		0.60	2.20	6.70	21.10	69.40
9	I use defensive techniques or tools when necessary to de-escalate situations.	4	1	23	38	114
		2.20	0.60	12.80	21.10	63.30
10	I participate in post-incident reviews to improve response protocols.	3	8	19	46	104
		1.70	4.40	10.60	25.60	57.80
Average Weighted Mean		4.56 Always				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (N - Never); 1.81-2.60 (R - Rarely); 2.61-3.40 (S - Sometimes); 3.41-4.20 (O - Often); 4.21-5.00 (A - Always)

Security guards demonstrated a high level of consistency in incident response and reporting, with an overall average rating of 4.56, categorized as "Always." The most frequently practiced actions included following established protocols (72.8%), securing the area after incidents (72.2%), ensuring the safety of those involved (71.1%), and accurately documenting events (70.6%). Guards also regularly assisted with evacuations and coordinated with first responders. However, fewer Always responses were recorded for using defensive tools

(63.3%) and participating in post-incident reviews (57.8%), suggesting these areas are less consistently practiced. The findings indicate that guards are reliable in core response duties but may require more structured training on using force appropriately and participating in post-incident evaluations. These aspects are often neglected due to fast-paced environments or a lack of follow-up systems. Addressing these gaps would help strengthen preparedness, improve decision-making during complex situations, and refine security protocols over time.

Table 8. *Level of Implementation of Crime Prevention and Violence Response Measures by Security Guards in terms of Collaboration with Law Enforcement Agencies*

No.	Collaboration with Law Enforcement Agencies	N	R	S	O	A
1	I communicate with law enforcement agencies during security incidents.	1 0.60	2 1.10	12 6.70	49 27.20	116 64.40
2	I provide accurate and detailed information to police when required.	1 0.60	1 0.60	8 4.40	37 20.60	133 73.90
3	I assist law enforcement officers during investigations.	7 3.90	2 1.10	14 7.80	41 22.80	116 64.40
4	I coordinate with law enforcement for joint security operations.	1 0.60	0 0.00	19 10.60	44 24.40	116 64.40
5	I participate in security briefings or drills involving law enforcement agencies.	7 3.90	7 3.90	18 10.00	33 18.30	115 63.90
6	I follow the chain of command when working with law enforcement.	7 3.90	2 1.10	9 5.00	40 22.20	122 67.80
7	I maintain professional conduct when interacting with law enforcement personnel.	2 1.10	2 1.10	8 4.40	35 19.40	133 73.90
8	I share relevant surveillance footage or documentation with authorities.	5 2.80	5 2.80	18 10.00	29 16.10	123 68.30
9	I seek guidance from law enforcement on handling complex security issues.	7 3.90	5 2.80	17 9.40	36 20.00	115 63.90
10	I contribute to building strong relationships with local law enforcement for improved security collaboration.	5 2.80	4 2.20	9 5.00	51 28.30	111 61.70
Average Weighted Mean		4.49 Always				

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (N - Never); 1.81-2.60 (R - Rarely); 2.61-3.40 (S - Sometimes); 3.41-4.20 (O - Often); 4.21-5.00 (A - Always)

Security guards consistently reported high levels of collaboration with law enforcement, with an average rating of 4.49, indicating an "Always" level of cooperation. Most guards indicated that they regularly provide detailed information to the police and maintain professional conduct, with both actions receiving 73.9% 'Always' responses. Other frequently practiced behaviors included following the chain of command and communicating with authorities during incidents. However, participation in joint briefings, sharing surveillance footage, and seeking guidance on complex issues were practiced less consistently. These responses suggest that while guards are reliable in immediate cooperation during incidents, deeper engagement, such as pre-planned coordination or structured feedback, is less frequent. The variation may stem from limited access to formal inter-agency programs or organizational constraints. Overall, guards demonstrate dependable collaboration during active incidents; however, the findings indicate opportunities for improvement in sustained coordination. Expanding joint training, increasing access to briefings, and formalizing feedback channels could strengthen public-private security partnerships.

Table 9. *Summary of the Level of Implementation of Crime Prevention and Violence Response Measures by Security Guards*

Variables	AWM	Interpretation
Monitoring and Surveillance	4.50	Always
Incident Response and Reporting	4.56	Always
Collaboration with Law Enforcement Agencies	4.49	Always
Mean	4.52	Always

Legend: 1.00-1.80 (N - Never); 1.81-2.60 (R - Rarely); 2.61-3.40 (S - Sometimes); 3.41-4.20 (O - Often); 4.21-5.00 (A - Always)

Security guards consistently demonstrated strong implementation of crime prevention and violence response measures, with an overall average of 4.52, categorized as "Always." Incident response and reporting scored the highest (4.56), reflecting prompt action, adherence to protocols, and proper documentation during incidents. Monitoring and surveillance are closely followed (4.50), supported by routine patrols and the active use of equipment. Collaboration with law enforcement (4.49) also ranked high, indicating regular and professional coordination. While all areas met the Always threshold, earlier item-level data showed that certain practices—such as post-incident reviews, technical tasks, and participation in joint drills—were less consistent. These findings

confirm that guards carry out core duties reliably but also highlight areas where performance could be improved. Strengthening technical skills, increasing inter-agency coordination, and formalizing follow-up practices would build on the existing foundation and improve readiness in more complex or dynamic situations.

3.4 Relationship between the Profile of Respondents and the Variables

This section presents the statistical analysis of the relationship between the respondents' demographic profiles and their levels of awareness and implementation of crime prevention and violence response measures.

Table 10. Relationship Between the Profile of Respondents and Level of Awareness regarding Crime Prevention and Violence Response

Profile of Respondents	Correlation Coefficient	Level of Awareness Regarding Crime Prevention and Violence Response		
		Crime Prevention Measures	Violence Response Protocols	Security Technologies Available in their Establishments
Age	r	0.050	0.141	-0.012
	Sig.	0.505	0.060	0.868
Gender	r	-0.083	-0.223**	-0.029
	Sig.	0.267	0.003	0.703
Years of Experience as Security Guard	r	-0.53	0.121	-0.74
	Sig.	0.481	0.106	0.321
Educational Attainment	r	0.023	0.089	-0.034
	Sig.	0.755	0.236	0.651
Type of Training Undergone	r	-0.003	-0.058	-0.017
	Sig.	0.970	0.438	0.823

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation results showed that most profile variables—age, experience, education, and training—had no significant relationship with security guards' awareness of crime prevention, violence response, or security technologies. The only significant finding was a weak negative correlation between gender and understanding of violence response protocols ($r = -0.223$, $p = 0.003$), indicating that male respondents, who comprised the majority of the sample, reported slightly lower awareness in this area. This points to a potential gap that could be addressed through more inclusive or gender-sensitive training. Overall, the data suggest that awareness levels are generally uniform across demographic groups, likely due to standardized training routines. Still, the gender difference highlights a need to reassess training approaches to make sure all groups are adequately prepared for violence response tasks.

Table 11. Relationship Between the Profile of Respondents and the Level Of Implementation Of Security Measures

Profile of Respondents	Correlation Coefficient	Level Of Implementation Of Security Measure		
		Monitoring and Surveillance	Incident Response and Reporting	Collaboration with Law Enforcement Agencies
Age	r	0.018	-0.089	-0.066
	Sig.	0.807	0.233	0.380
Gender	r	0.116	0.130	0.048
	Sig.	0.120	0.082	0.526
Years of Experience as Security Guard	r	0.027	-0.026	-0.170*
	Sig.	0.724	0.724	0.023
Educational Attainment	r	0.040	-0.077	-0.054
	Sig.	0.594	0.303	0.469
Type of Training Undergone	r	0.055	0.036	-0.021
	Sig.	0.464	0.634	0.777

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The analysis revealed that most profile variables—such as age, gender, educational attainment, and training—did not show statistically significant relationships with the implementation of security measures. However, a notable exception was found in the correlation between years of experience and collaboration with law enforcement. The result showed a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.170$, $p = 0.023$), suggesting that more experienced security guards may be less inclined to collaborate with external agencies such as the police. This pattern may be explained through the lens of organizational complacency, where long-serving personnel tend to rely more on routine procedures and internal mechanisms rather than engaging in active coordination. According to McCrie and Lee (2023), such behavior can emerge when institutional support for continuing engagement diminishes over time or when seasoned guards feel confident operating independently. Additionally, role fatigue or lack of updated inter-agency training may also limit proactive collaboration. Guards who have not participated in recent drills or updated protocols may find it more difficult or unnecessary to reach out to law enforcement unless required. The findings suggest a need for structured interventions, such as mandatory refresher programs and formalized

liaison roles, to prevent experience from translating into disengagement. By actively fostering collaboration between long-tenured guards and law enforcement units, establishments can maintain a responsive and coordinated security environment.

4.0 Conclusion

This study examined the level of awareness and implementation of crime prevention and violence response measures among 180 security guards in Urdaneta and Dagupan Cities. While results affirmed that security guards perform consistently in routine operations, key areas of concern emerged. Implementation scores indicated strong adherence to protocol in monitoring, reporting, and law enforcement coordination. However, specific gaps were noted in advanced preparedness, including the use of security technologies and situational response beyond routine duties. Notably, the study revealed underlying challenges related to experience and gender. The finding that longer years of service correlated with decreased collaboration with law enforcement suggests that institutional complacency or lack of retraining may erode effectiveness over time. Similarly, observed gender differences in awareness of violence response protocols signal the need for more inclusive, gender-sensitive security training. These insights highlight that operational success does not solely depend on tenure or routine experience, but also continual learning and equitable engagement strategies. To build on this research, future studies may adopt longitudinal designs to assess the long-term impact of retraining or inter-agency coordination programs. Qualitative approaches may also provide deeper insight into how gender and workplace dynamics shape awareness, response readiness, and perceived efficacy in the field. By focusing on these areas, institutions can better align their security operations with the evolving demands of urban safety and workforce diversity.

5.0 Contribution of Authors

This study was a collaborative effort involving specific roles and responsibilities assigned to each contributor. Syrenzo R. Sicuan, who served as the research adviser, provided overall guidance throughout the study. He was responsible for data analysis, interpretation of findings, and finalizing the structure and content of the paper to ensure its academic rigor and coherence. John Aron M. Dizon acted as the group leader. He led the data collection process, conducted surveys in Dagupan City, and made significant contributions to the writing of the manuscript's major sections. Joenico M. Sibayan assisted in survey administration in Dagupan City, contributed to writing parts of the study, and was also involved in organizing and gathering the data. Christine Mae C. Fronda and Clarissa V. Bocobo were both assigned to Urdaneta City, where they facilitated the distribution of surveys and data collection. Their efforts ensured the comprehensive coverage of the research locale, contributing to the reliability and completeness of the dataset used in the study.

6.0 Funding

This research was conducted without any external funding or financial support. All activities, including data collection, analysis, and manuscript preparation, were carried out independently by the researchers. No funding was requested or required for the completion of this study.

7.0 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to the conduct, analysis, or publication of this study. All contributions were made objectively and independently, without any personal, financial, or institutional influence.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to express their sincere gratitude to Dr. Marie Claire B. Briones, Campus Executive Director of Pangasinan State University – Binmaley Campus, for her unwavering support and encouragement throughout the completion of this study. Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Romeo A. Caloza, College Dean of the College of Criminal Justice Education (CCJE), and to Madam Saylee M. Honrado, Chairperson of CCJE, for their guidance and approval of the research undertaking.

The researchers sincerely appreciate the cooperation of the management of the selected establishments in Urdaneta City and Dagupan City for allowing the survey to be conducted. Most especially, heartfelt thanks are given to the security guards who generously participated in the study and shared their time, insights, and experiences, without which this research would not have been possible.

9.0 References

- Attan, A., Shamsudin, S., Mohd Noh, N. M. A., Nik Mahmood, N. H., & Ahmad, Z. (2018). Proposing a comprehensive approach to training needs for the development of communication skills among security guards. *LSP International Journal*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v4n2.51>
- Bowen, D. A., Anthony, K. M., & Sumner, S. A. (2022). Business and property types experiencing excess violent crime: A micro-spatial analysis. *Journal of injury & violence research*, 14(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.5249/jivr.v14i1.1566>
- De Bever, S., Formolo, D., Wang, S., & Bosse, T. (2019). A multimodal chatbot system for enhancing social skills training for security guards (pp. 499–513). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22646-6_37
- Effective Security Management. (2011). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-63531-5>
- Fagel, M. J., Fennelly, L. J., & Perry, M. A. (2020). The security officer of the 21st century. In *The Professional Protection Officer* (pp. 33–39). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-817748-8.00003-1>
- Franklin, C. A., Garza, A. D., Goodson, A., & Bouffard, L. A. (2020). Police perceptions of crime victim behaviors: A trend analysis exploring mandatory training and knowledge of sexual and domestic violence survivors' trauma responses. *Crime & Delinquency*, 66(8), 1055–1086. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001128719845148>
- Gordon, S. (2020). Securing workers beyond the perimeter. *Network Security*, 2020(1), 14–16. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-4858\(20\)30009-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1353-4858(20)30009-X)
- Grossberger, K. J. (2021). Retail security: Use of security guards. In *Encyclopedia of Security and Emergency Management* (pp. 839–846). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70488-3_57
- Hartel, P. H., & Junger, M. (2016). Book review: *Crime and everyday life* by Marcus Felson and Mary Eckert, 5th edition. *Crime Science*, 5(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-016-0058-5>
- H. Barte, B. C., L. Catugal, J., A. Largo, C., J. Paglinawan, L. B. Y., Culanag Jr., T., & F. Cuevas Jr., J. (2022). Level of preparedness of the school security personnel and their qualifications towards institutional security. *Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 06(02), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.46382/MJBAS.2022.6210>
- Mina, J. C., Aydinan, J. J. B., Campos, R. B., & Ayeo-eo, S. P. (2021). The safety and security measures of the selected universities in Nueva Ecija, Philippines: Its combat to the COVID-19 pandemic. *OALib*, 08(01), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107076>
- Pauya, P. G., & Flores, B. M. (2021). Job performance of security personnel in Delmonte Philippines, Inc. *Asian Journal of Business and Governance*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.7828/ajobg.v11i1.1420>
- Shirley P. Ayeo-eo. (2023). The competency of security guards in the performance of their responsibilities. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, 133–144. <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13267>