



TWIST

Journal homepage: www.twistjournal.net

Security Surveillance and the Rights to Privacy of Internal Stakeholders of Selected Universities in the National Capital Region (NCR), Philippines

Milagrosa M. Arante-Beato

De La Salle University – Dasmarinas, Province of Cavite, Philippines

Wilfredo D. Dalugdog*

Laguna State Polytechnic University, Province of Laguna, Philippines

[*Corresponding author]

Alrien F. Dausan

De La Salle University – Dasmarinas, Province of Cavite, Philippines

Abstract

This study was conducted to assess the importance of surveillance as mechanisms for safety and as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders. Descriptive research design was used to employ a valid and reliable questionnaire. Quota sampling technique was used in distributing the survey questionnaire via face-to-face distribution. Basic statistics, ANOVA, and Pearson r Correlation were used to treat the data gathered. The study revealed the importance of surveillance and security personnel in fostering a safe campus environment, with respondents generally affirming the adequacy of existing measures while identifying areas for improvement, such as demographic-specific concerns and infrastructure. Institutional affiliation and academic progression influence perceptions, but broader demographic factors show minimal impact. Stakeholders view surveillance positively, particularly regarding privacy safeguards and transparency though personnel training in data handling needs improvement. Privacy concerns are consistent across groups, emphasizing shared experiences and organizational culture. Finally, perceptions of safety and privacy risks are largely independent, underscoring the need for balanced and inclusive security strategies. In conclusion, surveillance and security personnel are essential to campus security, but improvements in addressing demographic-specific needs, infrastructure, and personnel training in data handling are necessary. Privacy concerns are universally shared, yet perceptions of safety and privacy risks are independent, highlighting the need to balance both aspects effectively. The study suggests that campuses should enhance security measures by addressing demographic-specific needs, upgrading infrastructure, and investing in advanced personnel training.

Keywords

Safety Mechanism, Security Surveillance, Threat to Privacy

INTRODUCTION

Security surveillance and crime prevention are critical concerns in public spaces where surveillance plays a key role in addressing crime (Kittle, 2018). In Surveillance Theory, surveillance is commonly defined as "close observation, especially of a suspected person" or "the act of carefully watching someone or something to prevent or detect a crime." However, modern surveillance technologies are often applied indiscriminately and ubiquitously, monitoring everyone in all contexts, locations, and networks (Marx, 2022). Lyon (2017), a prominent surveillance theorist, defines surveillance as the focused, systematic, and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection, or direction. Similarly, Haggerty & Ericson (2020) describe it as the collection and analysis of information about populations to govern their activities.

Surveillance has emerged as a powerful mechanism for protection, providing consistency and unbiased records of events. However, it raises critical questions about civil liberties. On one hand, surveillance is often stigmatized for

threatening freedom and reducing individual privacy. On the other hand, many believe it enhances security and contributes to societal improvement (Stoycheff, 2016). While public opinion remains divided, the implementation of surveillance technologies continues to expand rapidly (Hope, 2015). The increasing power and efficiency of surveillance technologies make the topic complex to understand. Researchers agree that designing surveillance system that respect privacy is essential to avoid severe consequences from unregulated growth (Taylor, 2010). Surveillance can be misused for control and abuse (Want et al., 1992) but can also generate significant societal benefits (Bharucha et al., 2006).

The origins of modern surveillance can be traced to Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon prison, where a central tower allowed a supervisor to monitor inmates, creating a sense of constant observation (Macnish, 2022). Marx (1998) notes that technological advancements have introduced complexities and mobility in surveillance, with tools like Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) offering widespread and anonymous monitoring akin to a modern Panopticon. CCTV surveillance, especially in public spaces like shopping malls, is often justified from a consequentialist perspective, balancing individual privacy concerns against the broader benefits of crime prevention and offender detection (Macnish, 2022).

Surveillance is inherently linked to privacy concerns. Privacy is valuable to both individuals and society, raising essential questions about its extent and significance. CCTV systems, ubiquitous in British urban areas, have also become common in institutions such as schools. Taylor (2010) emphasizes that privacy infringement through surveillance could have serious societal consequences, highlighting the need for a balanced approach.

Studies on surveillance in college campuses reveal unique challenges. Kittle (2013) notes that the large and dispersed environments of campuses make comprehensive surveillance costly and operationally complex. While tools like CCTV are often the primary security measures, questions remain about whether increased surveillance genuinely enhances safety or merely reduces fear. Hence, this study focuses on students' perspectives regarding surveillance and its dual role as a security tool and a potential threat to privacy.

Routine Activity Theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979) supports the role of surveillance in crime prevention. According to the theory, crimes are more likely to occur when three elements converge - a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardianship. Surveillance acts as a form of formal supervision, deterring offenders and monitoring routine activities to influence societal behavior patterns (Wikström, 2018).

In the school setting, Fry et al. (2016) found that U.S. schools adopt visible security measures like cameras, metal detectors, and guards to create safer learning environments. However, Eleyan & Persson (2019) highlight that surveillance evokes diverse emotions, balancing security benefits with privacy concerns. Students, as observed by Birnhack & Perry-Hazan (2020), often resolve this conflict by negotiating a balance between privacy and security, reflecting both personal experiences and broader constitutional principles.

Cappello (2019) explains that surveillance serves a dual purpose - protection and control. It is part of the social contract, where individuals' privacy may be compromised to uphold the safety and rights of others. In the Philippines, security surveillance, particularly CCTV systems, has become a focal tool for crime prevention in communities and institutions. For instance, Mabanglo (2020) found that Philippine College of Science and Technology (PhilCST) effectively implements security measures, including CCTV, which makes campus stakeholders feel safer. Similarly, Fantony (2021) found that CCTV systems in Our Lady of Fatima University are widely perceived as valuable for maintaining security, despite privacy concerns.

Notable incidents, such as the Ateneo de Manila University shooting in 2022, underscore the role of surveillance in crime resolution. CCTV footage is instrumental in identifying and apprehending the suspect (Gavilan, 2022). Such cases highlight the importance of balancing security with privacy concerns, as outlined in the Philippines' Republic Act No. 10173 or the Data Privacy Act. The law mandates transparency, legitimate purpose, and proportionality in processing personal information, providing guidelines for the ethical use of surveillance systems.

With the foregoing discussions, this study aims to explore the implementation of security surveillance in selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in the National Capital Region (NCR). It investigates whether surveillance systems infringe on stakeholders' privacy rights and examines their alignment with legal frameworks. Ultimately, the study seeks to provide insights for policy formulation regarding surveillance practices in higher education institutions.

Objectives of the Study

In general, this study was conducted to assess the importance of security surveillance as mechanisms for safety and the rights to privacy of selected universities in the National Capital Region (NCR). Specifically, this study aimed to determine the demographic profile of the respondents according to university category, respondents' category, age, sex, class standing (year level), college, length of stay, ideology, and religion. To determine the importance of surveillance as mechanisms for the safety of the university and the security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders.

Hypotheses of the Study:

1. To test if there is no significant difference in the respondents' assessment of security surveillance as an important safety mechanism when grouped they are grouped according to their profile variables
2. To test if there is no significant difference in the respondents' assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when they are grouped according to their profile variables.
3. To test if there is no significant relationship on the respondents' assessment between security surveillance as an important safety mechanism and as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders?

METHODOLOGY

The descriptive cross-sectional research design was used to assess the importance of security surveillance as safety mechanisms and as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders in the selected universities in the National Capital Region (NCR). The respondents of this study included students, teachers, staff, and security personnel from the selected universities in the National Capital Region (NCR). These respondents were chosen using a controlled quota sampling technique to ensure equal representation of the university's diverse stakeholders. Specifically, the sample comprised 20 students, 20 teaching personnel, 10 non-teaching personnel, and 5 security personnel, totaling 55 respondents per university. Hence, the total number of respondents for the study was 275. Controlled quota sampling technique is employed to address practical constraints, such as the absence of a complete sampling frame, and to prevent bias by ensuring balanced inclusion of all relevant subgroups. According to Vijayamohan (2024), controlled quota sampling involves setting predetermined rules about who can be included in the study, allowing the researcher to decide in advance how many participants from each group to include.

The researchers used a modified the survey questionnaire from Jesse T. Kittle's study, entitled *A Study of Surveillance and Privacy Rights*. It consisted of three parts. Part I focused on the profile variables of the respondents, which included university category, respondents' category, age, sex, year level (for students), college, length of stay in the university, ideology, and religion. Respondents indicated their answers by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided corresponding to their chosen response. The second part was used for the respondents' perceptions on security surveillance as an essential mechanism for ensuring the safety of university stakeholders. The third part was used for the respondents' assessment on security surveillance as a threat to the privacy of university stakeholders.

The modified survey questionnaire underwent content validity and reliability testing. The validators consisted of one academician, one university security officer, and one security consultant. All their comments and suggestions were incorporated into the questionnaire before it was distributed for the pilot test. The questionnaire was then distributed to 30 respondents to assess its internal consistency and reliability. It achieved Cronbach's alpha value exceeding 0.70, indicating that it was both valid and reliable for use in this study. According to Bujang et al. (2024), a minimum sample size of 30 respondents is sufficient to evaluate the reliability of a questionnaire. Furthermore, a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.70 or higher is considered indicative of a valid and reliable instrument.

Before conducting the study, the researcher first secured approval by sending request letters to the presidents of the selected universities in the National Capital Region (NCR). Once the approval was granted, the researcher began the face-to-face distribution of the survey questionnaires. The actual survey took approximately two months to complete. After the data collection, the researcher started encoding all the responses of the respondents in Microsoft Excel and requested the assistance of statistician for the appropriate application of statistical tools.

Appropriate statistical tools were employed to treat the data gathered. Frequency and percentage were used for the demographic profiles of the respondents. Mean and standard deviation were utilized for the respondents' assessment on the importance of surveillance as a mechanism for ensuring the safety of university stakeholders and as a potential threat to privacy. Before applying Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the statistician tested the distribution of the collected data. Shapiro-Wilk Test revealed that the data were normally distributed and had equal variance, which justified the use of parametric tests for hypothesis testing. Using ANOVA, the study identified a significant difference in the assessment of security surveillance as an important safety mechanism when grouped according to the respondents' profile variables. Conversely, no significant difference was found in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy when grouped by these same variables. Furthermore, Pearson's r correlation was employed to determine the significant relationship between the respondents' assessment of security surveillance as an important safety mechanism and their perception of it as a threat to privacy.

The cover letter and survey instrument, as approved by the research ethics committee, were distributed to the respective respondents. Careful consideration was given to factors such as informed consent, confidentiality, and the use of data. During data collection, a consent form outlining these guidelines was presented to the respondents and was signed by them if they agreed. Respondents were provided with both spoken and written information to ensure a clear and transparent explanation of the study's guidelines. The consent form included details about the study and encouraged respondents to ask questions if they had any. It also informed them of their rights, such as the option to decline answering specific questions or withdraw from the study at any time if they would feel uncomfortable. Furthermore, the form explained that the collected data would be used solely for this study and that respondents' identities would remain anonymous. For data storage, the researcher secured the completed printed survey questionnaires in a locked cabinet while responses submitted via Google Forms were deleted after the data had been analyzed. All data were stored in a password-protected Google Drive folder to ensure security. All information was treated confidentially and in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Finally, to ensure the originality of the research content, the paper was checked using the Turnitin application and reviewed by a language editing expert.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This part contains the presentation, interpretation, and analysis of data.

Table 1 Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Demographic Profile

	Frequency (N=275)	Percentage	Ranking
University Category			
Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Muntinlupa (PLMun)	55	20	3
Taguig City University (TCU)	55	20	3
Technological University of the Philippines (TUP)	55	20	3
Universidad de Manila (UDM)	55	20	3
Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Marikina (PLMar)	55	20	3
Respondents' Category			
Student	100	36.4	1.5
Teaching Personnel	100	36.4	1.5
Non-Teaching Personnel	50	18.2	3
Security Personnel	25	9.1	4
Age			
18-22 years old	83	30.2	1
23-27 years old	33	12	4
28-32 years old	30	10.9	5
33-37 years old	35	12.7	3
38-42 years old	26	9.5	6
43-47 years old	24	8.7	7
48 years of age and above	44	16	2
Sex			
Male	158	57.5	1
Female	117	42.5	2
College			
Criminology	106	38.5	2
Other Colleges	144	52.4	1
Length of stay in the University (N=175)			
2-3 years	67	24.4	1
4-6 years	50	18.2	3
7 years and above	58	21.1	2
Ideology			
Liberal	149	54.2	1
Moderate	65	23.6	2
Conservative	38	13.8	3
Political	7	2.5	5
Epistemological	16	5.8	4
Religion			
Roman Catholic	216	78.5	1
Iglesia ni Cristo	16	5.8	4
Jehovah Witness	2	.7	3
Islam	7	2.5	5
Others	34	12.4	2

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' profile variables. The study includes 275 respondents, equally represented by PLMun, TCU, TUP, UDM, and PLMar, with 55 respondents (20%) from each university, ensuring balanced representation. Most respondents are students or teaching personnel (35.4% each), followed by non-teaching personnel (18.2%) and security personnel (9.1%). This suggests that the study primarily reflects the views of academic staff and students, with less representation from non-teaching and security personnel. Regarding age, the largest group is 18-22 years old (30.2%), followed by those 48 and older (16%) and those aged 33-37 (12.7%). The smallest group is aged 43-47 (8.7%). This indicates a youthful demographic, with some representation from older individuals although there is a gap in the 38-42 age range. Gender-wise, 57.5% of respondents are male and 42.5% female. Most respondents are not from the criminology department (52.4%), with 38.5% from criminology. The majority have been at the university for 2-3 years (24.4%), followed by those with 7 or more years (21.1%), and the least have been there for 4-6 years (18.2%). This suggests that most respondents are relatively new to the institution. Lastly, in terms of political ideology, most respondents are identified as liberal (54.2%), followed by moderate (23.6%) and political (2.5%). This shows a liberal-leaning trend, with limited political engagement among respondents, possibly reflecting a lack of interest in formal political discourse.

Table 2 Respondents' Assessment on the Importance of Surveillance as a Mechanism for Safety of the University Stakeholders

Indicators	SD	Mean	VI	Ranking
1. I feel safe inside the campus.	.862	4.20	Agree	1
2. Safety and security are problems inside the campus.	1.242	3.03	Neutral	6
3. Security personnel make the campus safe and secure for the stakeholders.	.836	4.11	Agree	2
4. Security cameras on campus make me feel safe and secure.	1.091	3.87	Agree	5
5. Security surveillance increases campus safety.	.970	4.09	Agree	3
6. Surveillance cameras simply reduce fear of crime inside the campus.	1.018	3.93	Agree	4
Overall Mean & Standard Deviation	.629	3.87	Agree	-

Table 2 presents the respondents' assessment on the importance of surveillance as a mechanism for the safety of the university stakeholders. The survey findings reveal that indicator 1 ranks first, *I feel safe inside the campus*, obtaining a mean score of 4.20 and a standard deviation of .862, with a verbal interpretation of agree. It indicates that most of the respondents "agree" that they feel secure inside the campus. The relatively low standard deviation suggests a fairly consistent agreement across respondents. This aligns with findings from various surveys where a significant percentage of students reported feeling safe on campus during daylight hours although concerns often arise after dark (Bryant, 2022).

It is also observed that indicator 3 ranks second, *security personnel make the campus safe and secure for the stakeholders*, obtaining a mean score of 4.11 and a standard deviation of .836, with a verbal interpretation of agree. This reflects that respondents recognize the presence of security personnel as a key factor in maintaining campus safety, and the consistency of this response is reflected in the low variability. It is affirmed from the study conducted in the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus about campus safety survey in October 2022, which found that the students were satisfied with campus police interactions.

Meanwhile, indicator 5 ranks third, *security surveillance increased campus safety*, obtaining a mean score of 4.09 and a standard deviation of .970, with a verbal interpretation of agree. It reflects that the respondents perceive surveillance systems as valuable in enhancing campus safety. The higher standard deviation here implies that respondents' views on this aspect may vary more than in other areas. This is consistent with broader sentiments expressed in surveys where respondents said that improved security infrastructure, including surveillance cameras, is crucial for feeling safe on campus (Narayanan, Payne, Prior, & West, 2021).

However, it is observed that indicator 2 is the lowest in the ranking, *safety and security are problems inside the campus*, obtaining a mean score of 3.03 and a standard deviation of 1.242, with a verbal interpretation of neutral. This suggests that the respondents neither strongly agree nor disagree that safety and security are pressing issues on campus. The higher standard deviation here points to a wider range of opinions on whether safety is a problem, indicating that some respondents may feel there are security issues while others may not. It is affirmed by the study of Ezarik (2022), noting that feelings of safety can vary significantly among demographic groups, particularly women and students of color. In general, the respondents assessed the importance of surveillance as a mechanism for the safety of the university stakeholders with an overall mean score of 3.87 and a standard deviation of .629, with a verbal interpretation of agree. The respondents agree that surveillance is an important mechanism for ensuring the safety of university stakeholders inside the campus. The relatively low standard deviation indicates a moderate consensus on this overall perception. This aligns with the findings of Bryant (2022), noting that while many students feel safe overall, there is still a desire for enhanced safety measures and transparency regarding campus security.

Table 3.1 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to University Category

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	3.917	4	.979	2.527	.041	0.036
Within Groups	104.614	270	.387			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.1 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' university category. The results of the one-way ANOVA shows a statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' university category, $F(3,270) = 2.527$, $p = .041$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.036$. This indicates that 3.6% of the variance in the assessment of security surveillance can be attributed to group differences, suggesting a small but meaningful effect. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, it means that the differences between the group means are unlikely to have occurred by chance. In other words, at least one group's perception of security surveillance as a safety mechanism differs from the others. Since the effect size of 3.6% seems small, it suggests that factors related to group membership contribute to how respondents perceive the importance of

security surveillance on campus. The small but significant effect suggests that while group differences exist, these differences are not particularly strong. This may imply that most respondents agree on the overall importance of security surveillance, but some groups place slightly more or less emphasis on its role as a safety mechanism. It is affirmed by the study conducted by Mabanglo (2020) at the Philippine College of Science and Technology when he assessed campus security practices, revealing that perceptions of security measures varied significantly among different stakeholder groups (administrators, faculty, students, and visitors). The study utilized statistical methods, including ANOVA, to analyze differences in perceptions, similar to the present findings. Hence, it is concluded that familiarity with security measures influences how different groups perceive their effectiveness.

Using Tukey HSD, the study also computed a post hoc for multiple comparisons along the validation of the significant paired groupings: PLMun to TCU (MD = -.130, p-value .808); PLMun to TUP (MD = -.206, p-value .414); PLMun to UDM (MD = -.352*, p-value .027); PLMun to PLMar (MD = -.082, p-value .959). There is a statistically significant difference between PLMun and UDM, with PLMun having a lower difference score (MD = 0.352). This indicates that respondents from PLMun assessed security surveillance as less important compared to those from UDM. However, no significant differences were found between PLMun and TCU, TUP, or PLMar, as indicated by their respective p-values (0.808, 0.414, and 0.959), which are all greater than 0.05. As affirmed by Hattersley (2022) in his study in the University of Arizona's safety, he found that feelings of safety varied significantly among different demographic groups (e.g., gender, race). Female and minority students reported lower feelings of safety compared to their male counterparts. This variability reflects the group differences observed in the ANOVA results, suggesting that demographic factors influence perceptions of security measures.

Table 3.2 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Respondents' Category

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	1.688	3	0.563	1.427	0.235	0.016
Within Groups	106.843	271	0.394			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.2 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' categories. The results of the one-way ANOVA indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' category, $F(3,271) = 1.427$, $p = 0.235$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.016$.

This means that the difference in perceptions among the categories of respondents is not statistically significant. In other words, there is no evidence to suggest that the respondents (e.g., different groups such as age, gender, occupation, etc.) assessed the importance of security surveillance differently. Their assessments are similar overall. Since the F-ratio (1.427) is low and the p-value is not significant, it suggests that the difference in means between the groups is small compared to the variability within the groups. The effect size of 0.016 indicates that only 1.6% of the variance in the assessment of security surveillance as an important safety mechanism is explained by the differences between respondent categories. As affirmed by Jones et al. (2020), students generally view security surveillance as a necessary tool for safety rather than as a threat to privacy. The research indicates that the perceptions on security surveillance are largely consistent across various demographic categories, including age, gender, and occupation. This supports the ANOVA results showing negligible differences in the assessments based on respondent's categories.

Table 3.3 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Age

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	4.027	6	0.671	1.721	0.116	0.037
Within Groups	104.504	268	0.390			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.3 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' age. The results of the one-way ANOVA indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' age, $F(6,268) = 1.721$, $p = 0.116$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.037$.

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in how the respondents of different ages assessed the importance of security surveillance. In other words, the differences in perceptions of security surveillance between age groups are not significant enough to conclude that age plays a meaningful role in how security surveillance is viewed. Since the F-value of 1.721 is relatively small and the p-value is not significant, this suggests that any differences in the means across the different age groups are not substantial compared to the variability within each group. The effect size of 0.037 indicates that only 3.7% of the total variation in the assessment of security surveillance is explained by the difference in age. Auxier et al. (2019) emphasized that while there are some differences in privacy concerns across age

groups, these differences are often nuanced. For instance, older adults may express less confidence in their ability to control as to who access their personal information compared to younger adults. However, this does not necessarily translate into a significant difference in their overall assessment of surveillance as a safety mechanism. The report highlights that many individuals, regardless of age, acknowledge the importance of security measures, such as surveillance for safety purposes, aligning with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on age.

Table 3.4 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Sex

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	0.263	1	0.263	0.663	0.416	0.002
Within Groups	108.268	273	0.397			

**Significant at 0.05*

Table 3.4 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' sex. The results of the one-way ANOVA shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' age, $F(1,273) = 0.663$, $p = 0.416$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.002$.

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in how respondents of different sexes assessed the importance of security surveillance. In other words, there is no meaningful evidence to suggest that age has an impact on the way respondents view security surveillance as a safety measure. Since, the F-value of 0.663 is low and the p-value is not significant, it suggests that any differences in the average assessments of security surveillance across the age groups are minimal compared to the variation within each age group. The effect size of 0.002 indicates that only 0.2% of the total variation in the assessment of security surveillance is attributable to sexes. As affirmed by Park & Vance (2021), students across different genders often share similar attitudes toward surveillance technologies. The research indicates that perceptions of security surveillance as a necessary safety measure are consistent among students, regardless of their gender. This supports the ANOVA findings indicating that sex does not significantly influence assessments of security surveillance.

Table 3.5 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Year Level

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	3.143	3	1.048	2.834	0.042	0.081
Within Groups	35.489	96	0.370			

**Significant at 0.05*

Table 3.5 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' year level. The results of the one-way ANOVA indicated statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' year level, $F(3,96) = 2.834$, $p = 0.042$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.081$.

This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in how respondents from different year levels assessed the importance of security surveillance. In other words, year level does influence how respondents perceive security surveillance as a safety mechanism. Having F-value of 2.834 and p-value of significant differences suggests that the differences in mean assessments on security surveillance across year levels are larger than the variability within each group, leading to a meaningful difference. The effect size of 0.081 indicates that 8.1% of the total variation in respondents' assessment of security surveillance can be explained by their year level. While this effect size is not very large, it suggests that year level has a moderate impact on how respondents perceive the importance of security surveillance. As affirmed by Kittle (2013), individuals' perceptions of surveillance can vary significantly based on their educational experiences and year level. The study indicates that students in higher year levels often have more exposure to discussions about security and privacy, which can shape their views on the importance of surveillance as a safety mechanism. This aligns with the ANOVA results showing that year level influences perceptions of security surveillance.

Table 3.6 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Respondents' College

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	3.158	1	3.158	9.124	0.003	0.035
Within Groups	85.853	248	0.346			

**Significant at 0.05*

Table 3.6 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' college. The results

of the one-way ANOVA indicates statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' college, $F(1,248) = 9.124$, $p = 0.003$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.035$.

This indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in how respondents from different colleges assessed the importance of security surveillance. In other words, the college a respondent belongs to does influence their perception of security surveillance as a safety measure. The F-value of 9.124 and a significant p-value suggest that there is a substantial difference in mean assessments between colleges, and this difference is larger than the variability within the college groups. The effect size of 0.035 indicates that 3.5% of the total variance in assessment of security surveillance can be explained by the college affiliation of the respondents. While this is a small effect size, it still suggests that college affiliation has a meaningful, albeit limited, impact on how respondents perceive that importance of security surveillance. Kittle (2013) affirmed that students from different academic disciplines often have varying perceptions of surveillance. The study found that students in fields related to public safety or criminal justice may view security surveillance more favorably as a necessary safety measure compared to those in other disciplines. This suggests that college affiliation can influence how students assess the importance of security surveillance, aligning with the ANOVA results showing significant differences based on college.

Table 3.7 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Length of Stay in the University

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	1.630	2	0.815	2.104	0.125	0.024
Within Groups	66.606	172	0.387			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.7 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' length of stay in the university. The results of the one-way ANOVA indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' length of stay in the university, $F(2,172) = 2.104$, $p = 0.125$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.024$.

This means that there is no statistically significant difference in how respondents assessed the importance of security surveillance based on their length of stay in the university. In other words, how long a person has been at the university does not have a meaningful impact on his perception on the importance of security surveillance. The F-value of 2.104 which is relatively low F-value, combined with the non-significant p-value, suggests that any differences in the mean assessments of security surveillance across groups based on length of stay are small and not meaningful when compared to the variation within the groups. The effect size of 0.024 indicates that 2.4% of the total variation in the assessment of security surveillance can be explained by the respondents' length of stay at the university. This is a very small effect size, implying that the length of stay has little to no influence on how the respondents assessed the importance of security surveillance. According to Humble (2020), students' perceptions of security surveillance do not significantly change with their length of stay at a university. The study indicates that regardless of how long individuals have been at the institution, their views on security measures, including surveillance, tend to remain stable. This finding aligns with the ANOVA results showing that length of stay does not significantly influence assessments of security surveillance.

Table 3.8 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Ideology

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	0.506	4	0.126	0.316	0.867	0.005
Within Groups	108.025	270	0.400			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.8 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' ideology. The results of the one-way ANOVA shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' ideology, $F(4,270) = 0.316$, $p = 0.867$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.005$.

This means that there is no statistically significant difference in how the respondents assessed the importance of security surveillance based on their ideology. In other words, respondents with different ideological perspectives do not differ in their assessments of security surveillance in any meaningful way. The F-value of 0.316 which is very low F-value, combined with a non-significant p-value, suggests that the differences in mean assessments of security surveillance across ideological groups are extremely small and not statistically meaningful when compared to the variability within each group. The effect size of 0.005 indicates that only 0.5% of the total variance in the assessment of security surveillance is explained by respondents' ideology. This is a very small effect size, implying that ideology has a negligible impact on how respondents perceive the importance of security surveillance. Nam (2017) highlighted that

individuals from different ideological backgrounds often share similar concerns regarding surveillance practices. The research indicates that while ideological beliefs may shape attitudes toward various issues, they do not significantly alter perceptions of surveillance as a necessary safety measure. This aligns with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on ideology. Similarly, as mentioned by Korir et al. (2023), students' acceptance of surveillance technologies is influenced more by their cultural context than by their ideological beliefs. The findings suggest that students from various ideological backgrounds often converge in their views on security surveillance as a necessary tool for safety, which aligns with the ANOVA results indicating no significant differences based on ideology.

Table 3.9 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents Assessment on Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism When They Are Grouped according to Religion

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	2.023	4	0.506	1.282	0.277	0.019
Within Groups	106.508	270	0.394			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 3.9 presents the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which was conducted to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism according to respondents' religion. The results of the one-way ANOVA shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism among the respondents' religion, $F(4,270) = 1.282$, $p = 0.277$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.019$.

This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in how respondents from different religious backgrounds assessed the importance of security surveillance. In other words, religion does not have a meaningful impact on the respondents' perceptions on security surveillance as a safety mechanism. While the F-value of 1.282 is relatively low and the p-value is not significant, it suggests that the differences in mean assessments on security surveillance between religious groups are small and not meaningful compared to the variation within each group. The effect size of 0.019 indicates that 1.9% of the total variance in the respondents' assessment on security surveillance can be explained by their religious affiliation. This is a very small effect size, indicating that religion accounts for only a tiny portion of the variation in how respondents view the importance of security surveillance. Stoddart & Yngevesson (2018), said that individuals from various religious backgrounds often share similar views regarding surveillance as a necessary safety measure. The study emphasizes that while religious beliefs may influence certain ethical considerations, they do not significantly alter perceptions of surveillance's role in ensuring safety. This aligns with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on religion.

Table 4 Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders

Indicators	SD	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Ranking
1. Security surveillance is important as protecting the privacy rights of the university stakeholders.	1.407	3.37	Strongly Agree	3
2. With the installation of security surveillance inside the campus, the privacy rights of the university stakeholders are at stake.	1.254	3.33	Strongly Agree	6.5
3. The rights to privacy inside the campus are protected.	1.243	3.39	Strongly Agree	2
4. The university has existing guidelines for the data collection of personal information extracted through security surveillance.	1.227	3.32	Strongly Agree	8
5. The university has proper orientation in the installation of security surveillance in the protection of the rights to privacy.	1.245	3.33	Strongly Agree	6.5
6. It is important to know the process of the collection of personal data while within the university premises.	1.359	3.40	Strongly Agree	1
7. The university has a command center to handle the monitoring and data collected from security surveillance.	1.270	3.34	Strongly Agree	4.5
8. The university has trained personnel to handle the collection and safekeeping of all the data acquired through security surveillance.	1.250	3.28	Strongly Agree	9
9. The university has the capability for securing storage, ensuring accuracy, and a proper protocol for dealing with problems in the gathering of data through security surveillance.	1.220	3.34	Strongly Agree	4.5
Overall Mean & Standard Deviation	1.076	3.35	Strongly Agree	--

Table 4 presents the respondents' assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders. The survey finding reveals that indicator 6 ranks first, *it is important to know the process of the collection of personal data while within the university premises*, obtaining a mean score of 3.40 and a standard deviation of 1.359, with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. This suggests a high level of importance placed on transparency regarding data collection processes. Swinnerton & Pickering (2021) emphasized that transparency in the collection and use of student data is crucial for building trust among stakeholders. They argued that when universities clearly communicate how personal data is collected and used, stakeholders are more likely to support surveillance measures. This aligns with the finding that respondents strongly agree on the importance of knowing the process of data collection, as indicated by the high mean score for Indicator 6 in the results.

Indicator 3 ranks second, *the rights to privacy inside the campus are protected*, obtaining a mean score of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 1.243, with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. This indicates confidence in the campus's measures to safeguard privacy. Meanwhile, indicator 1 ranks third, *security surveillance is important as protecting the privacy rights of the university stakeholders*, obtaining a mean score of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 1.407, with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. This finding emphasizes the perceived dual importance of surveillance for both security and privacy protection. As mentioned by Park & Vance (2021), students are increasingly concerned about their privacy rights and expect institutions to protect their personal information. The 2019 report found that while students recognize the need for security measures like surveillance, they also value assurances regarding their privacy rights. This supports the high mean score for Indicator 3, which reflects confidence in the campus' measures to safeguard privacy.

The results indicate strong agreement on the importance of transparency in data collection and confidence in privacy protections on campus. Stakeholders appear to value security surveillance when it aligns with privacy safeguards. It implies that the university might consider enhancing stakeholders' awareness on data collection processes to sustain confidence in surveillance systems. As affirmed by Bansal & Nah (2022), individuals weigh the benefits of surveillance against potential privacy infringements. Hence, students often perceive security surveillance as a necessary tool for protecting both safety and privacy rights.

However, it is observed that indicator 8 ranks ninth, *the university has trained personnel to handle the collection and safekeeping of all the data acquired through security surveillance*, obtaining a mean score of 3.28 and a standard deviation of 1.250, with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. Although positively rated, this lower ranking highlights a potential area of concern regarding the adequacy of personnel training in data management. The lower ranking of indicator 8 suggests that stakeholders may perceive gaps in the training and competency of personnel managing surveillance data. Addressing this could improve trust and perceptions of privacy security. As affirmed by van Assen (2019), proper training and clear communication regarding data handling practices in higher education are important. The report indicates that inadequate training can lead to concerns about data security and privacy, which may affect stakeholder trust in surveillance systems.

In general, the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders obtained an overall mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 1.076, with a verbal interpretation of strongly agree. This demonstrates a generally favorable perception on security surveillance in protecting privacy, though with some room for improvement in specific areas. This finding is similar to the results of the study conducted by Antoine (2022), which revealed that a majority of students support data collection for improving educational outcomes as long as it is done transparently and ethically. This supports the study's overall mean score indicating strong agreement on the importance of security surveillance in protecting privacy.

Table 5.1 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to University Category

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
University Category	7.468	4	1.867	1.628	0.168	0.024
Residuals	309.677	270	1.147			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.1 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' university category. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in the assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according among the respondents' university category $F(4,270) = 1.628$, $p = 0.268$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.024$.

It implies that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups. In other words, the likelihood that any observed differences occurred by chance is high, so we fail to reject the null hypothesis of no difference in privacy threat perception across the university categories. Meanwhile, the eta-squared value of 0.024 represents a very small effect size, indicating that the university category explains only 2.4% of the variance in perceptions of surveillance as a privacy threat. As emphasized by Mutimukwe et al. (2021), attitudes toward surveillance and privacy are shaped more by organizational culture than by specific institutional categories. This research indicates that stakeholders within academic institutions tend to share similar concerns regarding privacy threats from surveillance technologies, reinforcing the idea that perceptions are influenced by shared experiences rather than by differences in university category.

Table 5.2 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Respondents' Category

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Respondents' Category	3.942	3	1.314	1.137	0.335	0.012
Residuals	313.203	271	1.156			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.2 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' category. The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' category $F(3,271) = 1.137$, $p = 0.335$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.012$. The ANOVA results indicate that the differences in the mean assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy among stakeholders, grouped by category, are not statistically significant. The F-value of 1.137 is associated with a p-value of 0.335, which is above the standard alpha level of 0.05. This means the null hypothesis, which assumes no significant difference between groups, cannot be rejected. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.012$) indicates that only 1.2% of the variance in assessments can be attributed to the respondents' category, which is a negligible effect size.

The findings suggest that the respondents' category does not significantly influence their assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy. The lack of statistical significance and the small effect size indicate minimal differences in perceptions across the categories. This suggests a shared or uniform viewpoint among university stakeholders regarding privacy concerns related to security surveillance, regardless of their specific category. According to Kim et al. (2023), students generally do not view security surveillance as a significant threat to their privacy, suggesting that collective experiences and institutional culture may overshadow differences based on specific demographic categories. This aligns with the ANOVA results indicating negligible differences based on category.

Table 5.3 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Age

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Age	6.346	6	1.058	0.912	0.487	0.020
Residuals	310.798	268	1.160			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.3 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' age. The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' age $F(6,268) = 0.912$, $p = 0.487$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.020$. The ANOVA results indicate that the differences in the mean assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy among university stakeholders, grouped by age, are not statistically significant. The F-value of 0.912 is associated with a p-value of 0.487, which exceeds the standard alpha level of 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis, which states there is no significant difference in assessments among the age groups, cannot be rejected. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.020$) suggests that only 2% of the variance in the assessment can be attributed to age, indicating a very small and practically insignificant effect.

The findings suggest that age does not significantly influence the university stakeholders' perceptions on security surveillance as a threat to privacy. The negligible effect size supports the conclusion that age-related differences in these perceptions are minimal and unlikely to have practical relevance. This uniformity in perceptions across age groups implies shared views on privacy concerns associated with security surveillance regardless of age. As affirmed by Auxier et al. (2019), while there are some differences in privacy concerns across age groups, these differences are often nuanced. For example, older adults tend to feel less control over their personal data compared to younger adults, but this does not necessarily translate into a significant difference in their overall assessment of surveillance as a threat. The report indicates that many individuals, regardless of age, share common concerns about privacy violations due to surveillance technologies, suggesting a uniformity in perceptions that aligns with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on age.

Table 5.4 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Sex

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Sex	0.747	1	0.747	0.644	0.423	0.002
Residuals	316.398	273	1.159			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.4 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' sex.

The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' sex $F(1,273) = 0.644$, $p = 0.423$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.002$. The ANOVA results show that the differences in the mean assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy between male and female respondents are not statistically significant. The F-value of 0.644 corresponds to a p-value of 0.423, which is well above the standard alpha level of 0.05. Consequently, the null hypothesis, which states there is no significant difference in assessments between the groups, is not rejected. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.002$) indicating a very small proportion of the variance in the assessment is explained by the respondents' sex, suggesting negligible practical significance.

The findings suggest that sex is not a significant factor in shaping the university stakeholders' perceptions of security surveillance as a threat to privacy. The minimal effect size further supports this finding, indicating that male and female respondents have almost identical assessments. This consistency across groups suggests a shared perception of privacy threats related to security surveillance that is independent of sex. Ardabili et al. (2024) noted that concerns about privacy violations due to surveillance are often shared across genders. The study highlights that both male and female respondents frequently express similar levels of apprehension regarding surveillance technologies, indicating that sex does not significantly influence perceptions of privacy threats. This aligns with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on sex.

Table 5.5 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Year Level

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Year Level	10.074	3	3.358	2.674	0.052	0.077
Residuals	120.554	96	1.256			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.5 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' year level. The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' year level $F(3,96) = 2.674$, $p = 0.052$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.077$.

The ANOVA results suggest that the mean differences in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy among stakeholders grouped by year level are not statistically significant. The F-value of 2.674 is associated with a p-value of 0.052, which is slightly above the conventional alpha threshold of 0.05. This means that the null hypothesis, which assumes no significant differences between groups, cannot be rejected. However, the p-value is close to the threshold, indicating a trend toward significance that may warrant further investigation with a larger sample size. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.077$) represents a small to moderate proportion of variance attributable to year level, suggesting some practical relevance despite the lack of statistical significance. Meier & Krämer (2022) posited that individuals assess the risks and benefits of surveillance based on personal experiences rather than by their year level. This theory suggests that perceptions of privacy threats are influenced more by individual circumstances and contextual factors than by one's academic standing, aligning with the ANOVA results showing negligible differences based on year level.

Table 5.6 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Respondents' College

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
College	3.709	1	3.709	3.449	0.064	0.014
Residuals	266.687	248	1.075			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.6 presents that one-way ANOVA was performed to test if there is a significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' college. The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' college $F(1,248) = 3.449$, $p = 0.064$, with an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.014$. The ANOVA results indicate that the mean differences in the assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy among university stakeholders, grouped by college, are not statistically significant. The F-value of 3.449, with a p-value of 0.064, exceeds the standard alpha level of 0.05, meaning the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.014$) suggests that the grouping variable (respondents' college) accounts for only a small proportion of the variance in the assessments, indicating a negligible practical impact.

These findings suggest that the perception of security surveillance as a threat to privacy does not significantly differ among university stakeholders based on their college affiliation. While there may be slight differences in means, these differences are not strong enough to conclude a meaningful or systematic variation. The small effect size further supports the notion that the variable of college affiliation has minimal influence on perceptions regarding surveillance-related privacy threats. In relation to this aspect, Odoemelam (2015) suggested exploring additional factors influencing perceptions of surveillance, such as personal experiences with technology, knowledge about privacy rights, and societal

context. She also added how societal adaptation to surveillance technologies often overlooks individual roles, emphasizing the need for a broader understanding of how various factors shape perceptions of privacy.

Table 5.7 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Length of Stay in the University

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Position	3.091	2	1.545	1.455	0.236	0.017
Residuals	182.633	172	1.062			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.7 presents ANOVA was performed to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' length of stay in the university. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups, $F(2,172) = 1.455$, $p < 0.236$, $\eta^2 = 0.017$. The ANOVA results suggest that the variability in the assessment of security surveillance as a threat to privacy among the different groups is not significant. The observed F-value of 1.455 falls within the critical region for a p-value of 0.236, which is greater than the standard alpha level of 0.05. This means that the null hypothesis, which posits no difference in assessments among groups, cannot be rejected. The effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.017$) indicates that a very small proportion of variance in the assessments can be attributed to the respondents' length of stay in the university.

These findings suggest that the perception of security surveillance as a threat to privacy does not differ significantly based on the length of stay of the respondents within the university. This implies that concerns about surveillance-related privacy threats may be similarly experienced across various stakeholder groups, regardless of their length of stay. The small effect size further supports the notion that respondents' length of stay has minimal impact on their assessments. As noted by Whitford & Yates (2022), public attitudes towards surveillance are often shaped by broader societal events rather than by individual length of stay. The authors argued that while stakeholders may have different length of stay in the university, their concerns about surveillance-related privacy threats tend to converge, supporting the findings that length of stay has minimal impact on perceptions.

Table 5.8 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Ideology

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p	η^2
Ideology	0.757	4	0.189	0.162	0.958	0.002
Residuals	316.388	270	1.172			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.8 presents ANOVA was performed to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to respondents' ideology. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups, $F(4,270) = 0.162$, $p < 0.958$, $\eta^2 = 0.002$. The p-value (0.958) is far greater than the standard significance threshold of 0.05, indicating that the respondents' ideology does not significantly influence their perception on security surveillance as a privacy threat. Additionally, the effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.002$) is extremely small, meaning that only 0.2% of the variance in the perception of security surveillance as a threat to privacy is attributable to differences in ideology.

The results suggest that differences in ideology have virtually no impact on how university stakeholders perceive the threat of security surveillance to privacy. The negligible effect size underscores that other variables, such as personal experience with surveillance or knowledge of privacy issues, might have a more substantial influence. Researchers should consider exploring these alternative factors to gain deeper insights into the factors shaping privacy concerns in a university setting. As mentioned by Friedewald et al. (2017), while ideological beliefs can shape attitudes towards privacy and security, they do not always lead to significant differences in perceptions across diverse groups. The book highlights empirical studies showing that citizens often share similar concerns about surveillance technologies, regardless of their ideological stance, suggesting that other factors may have a more substantial influence on these perceptions.

Table 5.9 Test of Significant Difference in the Respondents' Assessment on Security Surveillance as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders When They Are Grouped according to Religion

Cases	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	η^2
Religion	5.393	4	1.348	1.168	0.325	0.017
Residuals	311.752	270	1.155			

*Significant at 0.05

Table 5.9 shows that ANOVA was performed to test the significant difference in the assessment on security surveillance as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders when grouped according to the respondents' religion. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference among the groups, $F(4,270) = 1.168$, $p < 0.325$, $\eta^2 = 0.017$. The ANOVA results show that the p-value (0.325) is greater than the significance level of 0.05, indicating that differences in religion among respondents do not significantly affect their perception on security surveillance as a threat to privacy. The low effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.017$) further suggests that religion accounts for only 1.7% of the variability in these perceptions,

which is considered a very small effect. The absence of significant differences implies that the perception of security surveillance as a privacy threat is consistent across religious groups. This finding suggests that factors other than religion may play a more prominent role in shaping the stakeholders' views on security surveillance and privacy. Future research could explore other demographic or psychosocial variables to better understand what influences these perceptions. As affirmed by Power, Heavin, & O'Connor (2021), while surveillance can be seen as necessary for security, ethical implications and individual perceptions vary widely across different groups, suggesting that factors beyond religion may influence these views more significantly.

Table 6 Test of Significant Relationship between Security Surveillance as an Important Safety Mechanism and as a Threat to Privacy of the University Stakeholders

	Pearson's r	p-value	Effect size (Fisher's z)
Safety VS Privacy	0.019	0.757	0.019

*Significant at 0.50

Table 6 presents that Pearson r correlation was performed to test the significant relationship between the assessment on security surveillance as an important safety mechanism and as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders. The correlation value $r(0.019)$ suggests a negligible or very weak relationship between security surveillance as an important safety mechanism and as a threat to privacy of the university stakeholders. A p-value of 0.0757 is above the commonly used threshold of 0.05 for statistical significance. This implies that any observed relationship between the said variables could be due to chance, rather than to indicating a genuine correlation. The effect size of 0.019 is minimal.

While it reflects that the correlation is very weak and not statistically significant, it suggests that stakeholders' views on the importance of surveillance for safety do not strongly influence them, nor are they influenced by their concerns about privacy. In other words, whether stakeholders see surveillance as beneficial for safety does not seem to correlate with whether they view it as a privacy threat. It implies that individuals perceive these two aspects (safety and privacy) as independent considerations when it comes to security surveillance on campus. As affirmed by Birnhack & Perry-Hazan (2020), stakeholders typically recognize surveillance as enhancing safety while expressing ambivalence about privacy risks. However, the majority do not view these concerns as inherently conflicting, suggesting limited correlation between the two perceptions.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study highlights the critical role of surveillance and security personnel in maintaining a safe campus environment. While respondents generally find existing safety measures adequate, improvements are needed, particularly in addressing demographic-specific concerns and enhancing transparency. Institutional affiliation and academic progression influence security perceptions, but broader demographic or ideological factors do not significantly affect views on surveillance. University stakeholders generally perceive security surveillance positively, valuing its role in safety and privacy protection. However, the lower rating for personnel training in data handling indicates a need for improvement to strengthen trust and privacy security. Privacy concerns related to surveillance are widely shared among stakeholders, regardless of demographic differences, emphasizing the importance of inclusive strategies in addressing these issues. The study also finds no significant correlation between perceptions of security surveillance as a safety mechanism and as a privacy threat, suggesting these views are independent. While stakeholders acknowledge surveillance's safety benefits, privacy concerns do not strongly influence this perception. These findings underscore the need for balanced security policies that align surveillance measures with institutional values while safeguarding both safety and privacy.

The researchers would like to enhance campus security while addressing privacy concerns, institutions should prioritize transparency and communication by clearly outlining surveillance policies, including data collection, usage, and storage. Regular updates and open communication with stakeholders will help build trust and acceptance. Additionally, improving personnel training in data handling is essential to ensure ethical surveillance practices and responsible management of security footage, thereby strengthening privacy protections. Security measures should also be tailored to address demographic-specific concerns, as different groups within the university may have varying security needs. Conducting regular assessments and feedback sessions can help identify and resolve these issues effectively. Furthermore, institutions should continuously evaluate and adapt security policies to align with evolving safety needs and technological advancements. Periodic audits, stakeholder consultations, and research-based adjustments will ensure that surveillance remains relevant and effective. Inclusive privacy protection strategies should also be implemented, with clear guidelines on data access, retention, and disposal protocols. Engaging stakeholders in privacy policy discussions can foster a sense of security and cooperation. Lastly, a balanced approach to security and privacy must be maintained by integrating privacy-enhancing technologies, such as facial blurring, and restricting access to surveillance data. By adopting these measures, academic institutions can create a safer, more secure, and privacy-conscious environment for all stakeholders.

REFERENCES

1. Ardabili, B. R., Pazho, A. D., Noghre, G. A., Katariya, V., Hull, G., Reid, S., & Tabkhi (2024). Exploring public's perception of safety and video surveillance technology: A survey approach. *Technology in Society*, 78, 102641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102641>

2. Auxier, B., Rainie, L., Anderson, M., Perrin, A., Kumar, M., & Turner, E. (2019). Americans and privacy: Concerned, confused, and feeling lack of control over their personal information. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2019/11/15/americans-and-privacy-concerned-confused-and-feeling-lack-of-control-over-their-personal-information/>
3. Bansal, G. & Nah, F.F. (2022). Internet privacy concerns revisited: Oversight from surveillance and right to be forgotten as new dimensions. *Information and Management*, 59(3). <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378720622000301>
4. Birnhack, M. & Perry-Hazan, L. (2020). School surveillance in context: High school students' perspectives on CCTV, privacy, and security. *Youth & Society*, 52(7), 1312-1330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X20916617>
5. Bujang, M. A., Omar, E. D., Foo, D. H. P., & Hon, Y. K. (2024). Sample size determination for conducting a pilot study to assess reliability of a questionnaire. *Restor Dent Endod.* 49(1):e3. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10912549/>
6. Bryant, J. (2022). Campus safety a factor for most in college choice: Survey. <https://www.bestcolleges.com/research/campus-safety-survey/>
7. Campus Safety Survey. (October 2022). University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus. <https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider37/default-document-library/cu-anschutz-campus-safety-survey-2022.pdf>
8. Ezarik, M. (2022). Students mostly feel safe on college campuses, but not equally so. *Inside Higher Ed.* <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/06/22/survey-campuses-perceived-safe-some-students-not-all>
9. Friedewald, M. J., Burgess, P., Cas, J., Bellanova, R., & Peissl, W. (2017). *Surveillance, privacy and security citizen's perspectives*. Routledge. 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. <https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/5586410/Surveillance%20Privacy%20and%20Security.pdf>
10. Hattersey, R. (2022). Survey shows diversity, depth of video surveillance system use on campus. <https://www.campussafetymagazine.com/news/2022-campus-safety-video-surveillance-survey-results/118238/>
11. Humble, K. P. (2020). International law, surveillance and the protection of privacy. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1763315>
12. Jones, A. B., Richardson, M. J., Jensen, B. T., Whiting, E. F. (2020). Perceptions of school uniforms in relation to socioeconomic statuses. *Research in Middle Level Education*, 43(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2020.1759298>
13. Kim, Y., Kim, S.H., Peterson R.A., Choi, J. (2024). Privacy concern and its consequences: A meta-analysis. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 196, 122789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122789>
14. Kittle, J. T. (2013). *A study of surveillance and privacy rights*. East Tennessee State University. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1170/>
15. Korir, M., Slade, S., Holmes, W., Heliot, Y., & Rienties, B. (2023). Investigating the dimensions of students' privacy concern in the collection, use and sharing of data for learning analytics. *Computer in Human Behavior Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100262>
16. Mabanglo, J. K. L. (2020). Campus security practices' assessment of Philippine College of Science and Technology. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 4(4). <https://www.ijarp.org/published-research-papers/apr2020/Campus-Security-Practices-Assessment-Of-Philippine-College-Of-Science-And-Technology.pdf>
17. Meier, Y., & Krämer, N.C. (2022). The privacy calculus revisited: an empirical investigation of online privacy decisions on between-and within-person levels. *Communication Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502221102101>
18. Mutimukwe, C., Twizeyimana, J. D., & Viberg, O. (2021). Students' information privacy concerns in learning analytics: Towards model development. Nordic Learning Analytics Summer Institute. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354249262_Students%27_Information_Privacy_Concerns_in_Learning_Analytics_Towards_Model_Development
19. Nam, T. (2017). Does ideology matter for surveillance concerns? *Telematics and Informatics*, 8(34), 1572-1585. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.004>
20. Narayanan, P., Payne, E., Prior, H., & West, M. (2021). University safety department survey report. *University of Utah*. <https://publicsafety.utah.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/10/2022/01/U-Safety-Department-Survey-Report.pdf>
21. Odoemelam, C. E. (2015). Adapting to surveillance and privacy issues in the era of technological and social networking. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 5(6). <https://www.ijssh.net/papers/520-H140.pdf>
22. Park, J. & Vance, A., (2021). Data privacy in higher education: yes, students care. The voice of the Higher Education Technology Community. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2021/2/data-privacy-in-higher-education-yes-students-care>
23. Power, D. J., Heavin, C., & O'Connor, Y. (2021). Balancing privacy rights and surveillance analytics: a decision process guide. *Journal of Business Analytics*, 4 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2573234X.2021.1920856>
24. Stoddart, E. & Yngevesson (2018), Surveillance and religion. <https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/12885>

25. Swinnerton, B. & Pickering, J. (2021). Secure and transparent use of student data. *Times Higher Education*. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/secure-and-transparent-use-student-data>
26. van Assen, M. F. (2019). Training, employee involvement and continuous improvement – the moderating effect of a common improvement method: Production, planning & control. *The Management of Operations*, 32(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1716405>
27. Vijayamohan, P. (2024). *What is quota sampling? Methods, benefits, and how to use it*. <https://surveysparrow.com/blog/quota-sampling/>
28. Whitford, A. B., & Yates, J. (2021). Surveillance and privacy as coevolving disruptions: reflections on “notice and choice”. *Policy Design and Practice*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2022.2086667>
29. Williams, B. (2024). Descriptive Correlational Research Design Overview. <https://insight7.io/descriptive-correlational-research-design-overview/>

