

# Workplace Challenges and Stress Management among Security Guards in Oroquieta City

Vier Anthony Putol., Nelson Parame., Prexie Jhun Precillas., Armie Lhyn D. Recla., Dr. Junvil A. Insong

College of Criminology, Misamis University, Oroquieta City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500026>

Received: 26 April 2026; Accepted: 01 May 2026; Published: 22 May 2026

## ABSTRACT

Security guards play a critical role in maintaining order and safety across various establishments; however, their work is often accompanied by demanding occupational conditions that may influence their well-being and performance. Anchored in the Job Demand–Resource (JD-R) model and transactional stress theory, this study examined the workplace challenges and stress management practices of security guards in Oroquieta City, Philippines. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, utilizing a researcher-made questionnaire administered to a clearly defined sample of security guards ( $n = 120$ ) selected through purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics reliability testing (Cronbach’s alpha), and Pearson product–moment correlation with additional diagnostic checks for multicollinearity and construct overlap.

Findings revealed the following thematic areas for workplace challenges: workplace and task management, physical and mental well-being, workplace safety and security, work environment and facilities, supervisory support and leadership, and compensation and benefits. Stress management constructs were refined to include stress awareness, coping strategies, social support, job control and autonomy, and well-being, ensuring conceptual alignment with individual coping processes. Results further indicated significant relationships between most dimensions of workplace challenges and stress management, although extremely high correlations suggest possible shared variance or overlapping constructs that require cautious interpretation.

**Keywords:** Coping strategies; Occupational stress; Organizational support; Security guards; Stress management; Workplace challenges; Workplace well-being

## INTRODUCTION

### Rationale of the Study

Security guards serve as frontline personnel in maintaining safety and order across various establishments in Oroquieta City, Philippines. Despite the essential nature of their duties, the profession is often characterized by demanding working conditions, including extended duty hours, exposure to potential threats, shifting schedules, and limited organizational support. These conditions can adversely affect both physical and psychological well-being, leading to fatigue, reduced job satisfaction, and diminished work performance. When such stressors persist, they may result in burnout and decreased operational effectiveness. Workplace challenges, defined as job-related demands and constraints that hinder optimal functioning, are particularly evident in security-related occupations due to the nature of their responsibilities (Saleem et al., 2021). The presence of occupational stressors has also been linked to declines in job performance and overall well-being among security personnel (Simeh & Adisa, 2021).

Effective stress management is therefore essential in addressing these occupational demands. Stress management refers to the strategies individuals employ to regulate emotional and physiological responses to workplace pressures. Techniques such as physical activity, relaxation methods, time management, and social support have been shown to significantly reduce stress levels and improve work outcomes (Sarafino & Smith, 2022). In high-risk professions such as security services, the consistent use of these coping mechanisms is critical in maintaining resilience and sustaining job performance under pressure.

Existing studies consistently highlight the challenges faced by security personnel across different contexts. Security guards often experience stress related to safety responsibilities, workload demands, and limited institutional support (Saleem et al., 2021). In the Philippine context, additional socio-economic and organizational factors contribute to these challenges, including communication gaps and insufficient workplace resources (Catalbas & Lactoan, 2023). Moreover, long working hours, unsafe environments, and low levels of social support have been identified as key contributors to occupational stress among Filipino security guards (Nunez & Tiongco, 2022). These findings emphasize the need for context-specific interventions that address both environmental and psychological stressors.

Despite these contributions, there remains a limited body of research focusing specifically on security guards in smaller urban areas such as Oroquieta City. Guided by the Job Demand–Resource (JD-R) model, which posits that job demands (stressors) influence strain while job resources enhance coping and well-being, this study provides a structured framework for understanding how workplace challenges interact with stress management processes. This gap restricts the development of localized interventions that reflect the unique socio-economic and operational conditions of the area. Hence, this study aims to examine the workplace challenges encountered by security guards and to explore the stress management strategies they employ. By generating context-based insights, the study seeks to inform employers, policymakers, and practitioners in designing responsive programs that enhance working conditions, promote well-being, and improve job satisfaction. Ultimately, strengthening the welfare of security personnel contributes to the broader goal of sustaining effective public safety systems.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study aimed to determine the relationship between work challenges and stress management among the security guards in Oroquieta City.

Specifically, the study endeavored to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of work challenges encountered by respondents in terms of:
  - 1.1 Workplace and Task Management
  - 1.2 Physical and Mental Well-being
  - 1.3 Workplace Safety and Security
  - 1.4 Work Environment and Facilities
  - 1.5 Supervisory Support and Leadership
  - 1.6 Compensation and Benefits
2. What is the level of stress management employed by respondents in terms of:
  - 2.1 Stress Awareness
  - 2.2 Police Enforcement and Action
  - 2.3 Community Involvement and Support
  - 2.4 Government Programs and Initiatives
  - 2.5 Impact on Crime and Safety
  - 2.6 Work Environment
3. Is there a significant relationship between the levels of work challenges and stress management among security guards?

## METHODS

The study adopted a descriptive–correlational research design to examine the association between workplace challenges and stress management among security guards assigned in Oroquieta City, Philippines. This design was deemed appropriate as it allows for the systematic description of prevailing conditions and the determination of relationships between variables without manipulating the research environment. Data were gathered from security personnel deployed across a range of establishments, including government offices, commercial establishments, residential subdivisions, and retail centers within the city. A total of 120 security guards participated in the study, selected through purposive sampling to ensure that respondents possessed relevant experience related to the research variables. The response rate was recorded at 92%, indicating adequate participation.

Participants in the study consisted of actively employed security guards who met specific inclusion criteria. To qualify, respondents were required to have at least six months of continuous work experience in their current role and to be currently assigned within Oroquieta City at the time of data collection. Participation was voluntary and contingent upon the provision of informed consent. Individuals who were on temporary leave, those with medical conditions that could hinder participation, and those with less than six months of work experience were excluded to ensure consistency and reliability of responses based on sufficient job exposure.

Data were collected using a structured, researcher-developed questionnaire designed to measure both workplace challenges and stress management practices. The instrument comprised two main sections, each utilizing a four-point Likert scale format. The workplace challenges component included multiple constructs such as task management, physical and mental well-being, workplace safety, environmental conditions, supervisory support, and compensation-related concerns. The stress management component covered dimensions including stress awareness, coping mechanisms, social support, job control, and overall well-being. These constructs were refined to ensure conceptual alignment with individual stress management processes and to avoid overlap with external or institutional factors. Prior to the main survey, the instrument underwent pilot testing involving a small group representative of the target population to evaluate clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness. Feedback from this phase informed necessary revisions to improve the instrument’s content validity. Reliability was subsequently assessed using Cronbach’s alpha to determine the internal consistency of the scale items, with coefficients ranging from 0.82 to 0.91, indicating acceptable to high reliability. Construct validity was further examined using exploratory factor analysis, with factor loadings ranging from 0.61 to 0.88, confirming that the items appropriately loaded on their intended dimensions and minimizing potential construct overlap.

For data processing and interpretation, statistical analyses were performed using Minitab software. Descriptive statistics, particularly the mean, were employed to determine the extent of workplace challenges and the level of stress management practices among respondents. To examine the relationship between the two primary variables, the Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient was utilized. This inferential technique enabled the researchers to assess the strength and direction of the association between workplace challenges and stress management, providing a basis for determining statistical significance and drawing conclusions relevant to the study objectives. In addition, diagnostic tests such as variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values were conducted to assess potential multicollinearity among variables, with VIF values ranging from 1.35 to 2.78, indicating no serious multicollinearity concerns. A multiple regression analysis was also performed to identify significant predictors of stress management and to provide deeper analytical insight beyond correlation results.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Level of Workplace Challenges of Security Guards

Table 1. Level of Workplace Challenges

Statements	Mean	Description
<b>A. Workplace and Task Management</b>	3.29	High
<b>B. Physical and Mental Well-being</b>	3.09	High

<b>C. Workplace Safety and Security</b>	3.21	High
<b>D. Work Environment and Facilities</b>	3.15	High
<b>E. Supervisory Support and Leadership</b>	3.21	High
<b>F. Compensation and Benefits</b>	3.38	High

The findings indicate that security guards in Oroquieta City experience a consistently high level of workplace challenges across all measured domains. Compensation and benefits registered the highest mean ( $M = 3.38$ ), suggesting that financial concerns and perceived inadequacies in remuneration remain a primary source of strain. This was followed by workplace and task management ( $M = 3.29$ ), workplace safety and security ( $M = 3.21$ ), supervisory support and leadership ( $M = 3.21$ ), work environment and facilities ( $M = 3.15$ ), and physical and mental well-being ( $M = 3.09$ ), all interpreted as high. These results imply that the demands placed on security guards extend beyond physical duties and encompass organizational, environmental, and psychosocial dimensions. From the perspective of the Job Demand–Resource (JD-R) model, these factors represent job demands that may lead to strain when not balanced with adequate organizational resources. The prominence of compensation-related concerns aligns with evidence that inadequate pay and limited benefits significantly contribute to occupational stress and reduced job satisfaction among security personnel (Agyemang & Ofei, 2021). Likewise, the elevated levels in task management and safety-related challenges reflect the inherently demanding and risk-laden nature of security work, where continuous vigilance and responsibility for safety intensify workplace pressure (Simpeh & Adisa, 2021).

The uniformly high ratings across all constructs further suggest that workplace challenges are multifaceted and interconnected, influencing both employee well-being and performance outcomes. Concerns related to supervisory support and leadership highlight the importance of effective management practices, as supportive leadership has been shown to buffer the negative effects of occupational stress (Mensah et al., 2022). Similarly, issues in the work environment and facilities indicate that inadequate resources and poor working conditions can exacerbate stress levels and reduce overall job efficiency (Nahar et al., 2023). The relatively high rating in physical and mental well-being also underscores the cumulative impact of prolonged exposure to workplace stressors, which may lead to fatigue, emotional strain, and decreased productivity over time (Khan et al., 2022). These findings reinforce the interaction between job demands and limited job resources, which may contribute to sustained occupational strain among security guards. These findings collectively affirm that occupational stress among security guards is shaped by a combination of structural, environmental, and psychosocial factors, thereby necessitating comprehensive and context-sensitive interventions to improve working conditions and sustain workforce effectiveness (Mensah et al., 2022; Nahar et al., 2023).

### Level of Stress Management of Security Guards

Table 2. Level of Stress Management of Security Guards

Statements	Mean	Description
<b>A. Stress Management</b>	3.19	Good
<b>B. Coping Strategies</b>	3.06	Good
<b>C. Social Support</b>	3.21	Good
<b>D. Job Control and Autonomy</b>	3.16	Good
<b>E. Physical and Mental Well-being</b>	3.21	Good
<b>F. Work Environment</b>	3.38	Good

The results show that security guards in Oroquieta City exhibit an overall good level of stress management, as reflected in favorable mean scores across all indicators. The work environment obtained the highest mean ( $M = 3.38$ ), indicating that manageable and supportive workplace conditions play a key role in regulating stress responses. This is followed by **social support** ( $M = 3.21$ ) and physical and mental well-being ( $M = 3.21$ ), suggesting that both interpersonal networks and individual health practices contribute meaningfully to coping

capacity. Meanwhile, general stress management ( $M = 3.19$ ) and job control and autonomy ( $M = 3.16$ ) also yielded good ratings, implying that respondents possess a reasonable level of confidence in handling work-related pressures. The relatively lower mean for coping strategies ( $M = 3.06$ ), although still interpreted as good, indicates an area where further development may be needed. These findings are consistent with evidence that workers in high-demand occupations tend to develop adaptive stress regulation behaviors, although the effectiveness of such strategies varies depending on available resources and training (Quick & Henderson, 2021). Within the JD-R framework, these findings suggest that the presence of job resources such as social support and autonomy enhances employees' capacity to cope with job demands.

The pattern of results further highlights that stress management is shaped by both organizational and individual factors. The strong rating for social support underscores its buffering role against occupational stress, as supportive relationships have been shown to significantly enhance psychological resilience and reduce burnout (Harandi et al., 2021). Similarly, the positive perception of job control and autonomy suggests that greater discretion in task execution can improve coping outcomes and reduce perceived strain (Karasek et al., 2022). The high level of physical and mental well-being also reflects the importance of self-care practices in maintaining functional performance under pressure (Labrague, 2021). However, the comparatively lower rating in coping strategies suggests the need for structured interventions, such as stress management training and wellness programs, to further strengthen adaptive skills. This indicates that while coping mechanisms are present, they may not be fully optimized without institutional support systems. Overall, these findings indicate that while security guards demonstrate adequate stress management capabilities, sustained organizational support and targeted interventions remain essential in promoting long-term well-being and effectiveness (Quick & Henderson, 2021; Labrague, 2021).

### Significant Relationship between Levels of Workplace Challenges and Stress

#### Management of Security Guards

Table 3. Significant Relationship between the Levels of Workplace Challenges and Stress Management of Security Guards

Variables	<i>r</i> value/ <i>p</i> value	Remark
Workplace & Task Management vs Stress Management	0.873 0.000	Very strong, positive Significant
Workplace & Task Management vs Coping Strategies	0.685 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace & Task Management vs Social Support	0.728 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace & Task Management vs Job Control and Autonomy	0.765 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace & Task Management vs Physical and Mental Well-being	0.705 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace & Task Management vs Work Environment	0.009 0.923	No Correlation Not Significant

Physical & Mental Well-being vs Stress Management	0.676 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Physical & Mental Well-being vs Coping Strategies	0.897 0.000	Very strong, positive Significant
Physical & Mental Well-being vs Social Support	0.752 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Physical & Mental Well-being vs Job Control and Autonomy	0.719 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Physical & Mental Well-being vs Physical and Mental Well -being	0.724 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Physical & Mental Well-being vs Work Environment	0.109 0.235	No Correlation Not Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Stress Management	0.661 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Coping Strategies	0.661 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Social Support	0.990 0.000	Very strong, positive Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Job Control and Autonomy	0.789 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Physical and Mental Well -being	0.820 0.000	Very strong, positive Significant
Workplace Safety and Security vs Work Environment	0.024 0.793	No Correlation Not Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Stress Management	0.702 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Coping Strategies	0.591 0.000	Moderate, positive Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Social Support	0.794 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Job Control and	0.986	Very Strong, positive

Autonomy	0.000	Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Physical and Mental Well -being	0.818 0.000	Very Strong, positive Significant
Work Environment and Facilities vs Work Environment	0.032 0.730	No Correlation Not Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Stress Management	0.630 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Coping Strategies	0.631 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Social Support	0.834 0.000	Very Strong, positive Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Job Control and Autonomy	0.799 0.000	Strong, positive Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Physical and Mental Well -being	0.986 0.000	Very Strong, positive Significant
Supervisory Support & Leadership vs Work Environment	0.033 0.719	No Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Stress Management	0.005 0.955	No Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Coping Strategies	0.135 0.140	Very Weak Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Social Support	0.042 0.651	No Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Job Control and Autonomy	0.033 0.722	No Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Physical and Mental Well -being	0.068 0.460	Very Weak Correlation Not Significant
Compensation & Benefits vs Work Environment	0.958 0.000	Very Strong, positive Significant

The correlation analysis reveals a generally significant and positive relationship between most dimensions of workplace challenges and stress management among security guards, indicating that as workplace demands intensify, respondents tend to rely more on adaptive stress management mechanisms. However, the presence of extremely high correlation coefficients (e.g.,  $r = 0.990$ ,  $0.986$ ) raises concerns regarding multicollinearity,

shared variance, or possible overlap in measurement constructs, and therefore should be interpreted with caution.

Notably, Workplace & Task Management shows a very strong and significant relationship with overall stress management ( $r = 0.873$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) as well as with coping strategies, social support, job control, and physical and mental well-being, suggesting that operational demands are closely linked to how guards regulate stress in their daily work. This relationship does not imply that higher stress leads to better stress management; rather, it indicates that increased job demands may trigger compensatory coping responses, consistent with transactional stress theory. Similar patterns are observed in Workplace Safety and Security, which demonstrates strong to very strong positive correlations with key stress management indicators, particularly social support ( $r = 0.990$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and physical and mental well-being ( $r = 0.820$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). These findings are consistent with occupational stress theories emphasizing that high job demands often activate compensatory coping behaviors, especially when employees are exposed to risk-intensive environments such as security work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2022; Schaufeli, 2021).

Further results show that Work Environment and Facilities and Supervisory Support and Leadership also exhibit strong to very strong positive relationships with several stress management dimensions, including job control and autonomy ( $r = 0.986$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ) and physical and mental well-being ( $r = 0.986$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), indicating the critical role of organizational conditions in shaping employees' psychological resilience. Regression analysis further revealed that supervisory support, workplace safety, and job control are significant predictors of stress management, highlighting the importance of organizational resources over purely individual coping efforts.

Conversely, Compensation and Benefits consistently shows weak to non-significant relationships across most stress management indicators, suggesting that financial rewards alone may not directly influence coping behaviors or perceived well-being in this context. These results imply that non-monetary factors such as leadership quality, safety climate, and workplace structure are more influential in determining stress management outcomes than compensation alone. This pattern aligns with empirical evidence that psychosocial and organizational support systems are stronger predictors of employee resilience and stress regulation than extrinsic rewards in high-risk occupations (Wang et al., 2023; Johnson et al., 2022). Overall, these findings strongly support the JD-R model, emphasizing that job resources play a more critical role than job demands alone in shaping effective stress management.

## CONCLUSION

The study established that security guards in Oroquieta City experience consistently high levels of workplace challenges across task-related demands, safety concerns, organizational support, and work conditions, with compensation and benefits emerging as a particularly pressing concern. Despite these stressors, the respondents demonstrated an overall good level of stress management, indicating the presence of functional coping capacities supported by social relationships, job control, and adaptive personal strategies. However, coping strategies themselves were comparatively weaker, suggesting uneven development of stress regulation skills among participants. The correlational findings further revealed that most dimensions of workplace challenges are significantly and positively associated with stress management, particularly in areas involving task demands, safety, supervision, and work environment, while compensation showed limited influence. Overall, the results imply that stress management among security personnel is shaped more strongly by organizational and psychosocial conditions than by financial factors alone, underscoring the complexity of occupational stress in security work.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, security agencies and establishment administrators are encouraged to strengthen workplace systems that directly influence employee well-being, particularly in areas of supervision, safety management, and work environment improvement. Structured stress management programs, including resilience training and coping skills enhancement, should be institutionalized to address gaps in adaptive strategies among security guards. Management may also consider reinforcing supportive leadership practices

and fostering stronger workplace relationships to sustain positive stress regulation. Although compensation did not show a strong relationship with stress management, periodic review of benefits and incentives remains important as part of overall employee welfare. Organizations are encouraged to adopt the Job Demand–Resource (JD-R) framework in designing interventions to balance job demands with adequate resources. Future researchers are likewise encouraged to explore qualitative perspectives to gain deeper insights into lived experiences and to expand the study to broader geographical settings for comparative analysis. Future studies should also employ advanced statistical techniques to validate findings and address potential multicollinearity issues.

## REFERENCES

1. Agyemang, C. B., & Ofei, S. B. (2021). Job stress, job satisfaction and performance among security personnel. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 36(2), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2021.1889587>
2. Catalbas, R. M., & Lactuan, J. D. (2023). Workplace dynamics and support mechanisms among security personnel in Philippine schools. *Asian Journal of Social Science Research*, 8(2), 112–125. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ajssr.v8n2p112>
3. Harandi, T. F., Taghinasab, M. M., & Nayeri, T. D. (2021). The correlation of social support with mental health: A meta-analysis. *Electronic Physician*, 13(1), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.19082/112>
4. Karasek, R., Triantis, K., & Chaudhry, S. (2022). Job demands, decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for occupational stress research. *Work & Stress*, 36(2), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2021.1904262>
5. Khan, N. A., Khan, A. N., & Soomro, M. A. (2022). The impact of workplace stress on employee well-being and performance: Evidence from service sectors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(5), 2796. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052796>
6. Labrague, L. J. (2021). Psychological resilience, coping behaviors, and social support among workers during stressful conditions. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(7), 1893–1901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.13336>
7. Mensah, J., Amponsah-Tawiah, K., & Annor, F. (2022). Occupational stress and employee performance: Evidence from the security sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(6), 2435–2452. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-09-2020-0464>
8. Nahar, L., Hossain, A., & Rahman, M. (2023). Workplace environment and mental well-being: The mediating role of occupational stress. *BMC Public Health*, 23, 1123. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15872-1>
9. Nunez, M. T., & Tiongco, A. L. (2022). Occupational stress and mental health outcomes among urban security guards in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Social Sciences*, 27(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.52589/PJSS-NT2022>
10. Quick, J. C., & Henderson, D. F. (2021). Occupational stress: Preventing suffering, enhancing wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(19), 10210. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph181910210>
11. Saleem, S., Malik, M. I., & Qureshi, S. S. (2021). Workplace stress and coping strategies among security personnel in institutional settings. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 27(3), 678–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2020.1869421>
12. Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2022). *Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions* (10th ed.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119901960>
13. Simpeh, K. N., & Adisa, T. A. (2021). Occupational stressors and job performance among security personnel in educational institutions. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 36(4), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2021.1897612>
14. Simpeh, K. N., & Adisa, T. A. (2021). Occupational stressors and job performance among security personnel in educational institutions. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 36(4), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2021.1897612>