

Security Perception at Public University in Central Mexico

Cruz García-Lirios^{1*} and Javier Carreón Guillén²

¹Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, Mexico

²Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

***Corresponding author:** Javier Carreón Guillén, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 📅 December 15, 2023

Published: 📅 December 21, 2023

Citation: Cruz García-Lirios and Javier Carreón Guillén. Security Perception at Public University in Central Mexico. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 54(2)-2023. BJSTR. MS.ID.008527.

ABSTRACT

Security has been a central theme and axis on the public agenda of countries. It is a phenomenon that the literature has approached from the perspective of the media and the perception of political and social actors, as well as public and private sectors around a common future of security, although new proposals refer to the observation of the asymmetries between the parties involved.

Keywords: Covid-19; Perception; Risk; Security

Introduction

The concept of public security and efforts to maintain it have a long history that spans centuries and is intertwined with the development of organized societies and governments. The history of public security:

Ancient Civilizations

The earliest forms of public security can be traced back to ancient civilizations, such as Mesopotamia, Egypt, and China (Huang [1]). These societies had rudimentary law enforcement systems to maintain order and protect their populations.

Roman Empire

The Romans established one of the most advanced legal and law enforcement systems in ancient history (Leung [2]). They had a well-organized police force called the «Cohortes Urbanae» responsible for maintaining order in the city of Rome.

Medieval and Feudal Periods

During the Middle Ages, public security was often the

responsibility of local lords and their feudal systems (Balapour [3]). These feudal lords had their own guards and enforcers to protect their lands and maintain order.

Early Modern Period

With the rise of centralized monarchies in Europe, the concept of public security evolved (Meskaran [4]). Professional law enforcement agencies, such as the English Bow Street Runners and the French «Maréchaussée» (the predecessor of the Gendarmerie), were established to enforce laws and protect the public.

Industrial Revolution

The rapid urbanization and industrialization of the 18th and 19th centuries led to increased crime rates and the need for more organized law enforcement (Van [5]). Police forces expanded in response to these challenges.

Modern Period

In the 20th century, public security agencies continued to evolve

and adapt to changing societal needs (Evans [6]). The concept of homeland security emerged, particularly in response to global conflicts and the threat of terrorism. The creation of agencies like the U.S. Department of Homeland Security in the early 21st century exemplifies this trend.

Technological Advances

Advances in technology, such as the development of forensic science, surveillance technologies, and communication systems, have played a significant role in enhancing public security efforts (Greco [7]).

Globalization

In a globalized world, public security has become an international concern. Nations collaborate on issues like counterterrorism, border security, and cybercrime to address threats that transcend national borders (Gaufman [8]).

Human Rights and Civil Liberties

Alongside efforts to enhance public security, there has been an ongoing debate about the balance between security and individual rights and freedoms (Chen [9]). This debate has led to the development of legal frameworks and oversight mechanisms to protect civil liberties.

Contemporary Challenges

Public security efforts today encompass a wide range of challenges, including cybersecurity, counterterrorism, disaster preparedness, and response to global health crises (as demonstrated by the COVID-19 pandemic) (Coppola [10]). The history of public security is marked by a continual adaptation to changing societal needs, technological advancements, and evolving threats (Gull, et al. [11]). It reflects the complex relationship between governments, law enforcement agencies, and the populations they serve in the quest to maintain public safety and order. Overview of some key theories and concepts related to public security and security studies in general.

Security Studies

Security studies is an interdisciplinary field that examines the theory and practice of security (Khattak, et al. [12]). It encompasses various subfields, including international security, national security, and public security. Scholars in this field analyze the causes of conflicts, threats to security, and strategies for maintaining peace and stability.

Realism

Realism is a prominent theory in international relations and security studies. It asserts that states primarily seek to maximize their own security and power (Baraković, et al. [13]). In the context of public security, realists would argue that governments prioritize protecting their interests, often through military strength and deterrence.

Liberalism

Liberalism, in contrast to realism, emphasizes cooperation, international institutions, and the rule of law (Halaweh [14]). Liberals argue that security can be achieved through diplomacy, trade, and international organizations. In the context of public security, liberals might advocate for collaboration and conflict resolution through peaceful means.

Constructivism

Constructivist theory emphasizes the role of ideas, norms, and identities in shaping security dynamics (Kříž [15]). It suggests that security threats are socially constructed, and changing perceptions and identities can lead to shifts in security practices. For public security, this theory might focus on how societal values and norms influence security policies and priorities.

Human Security

Human security theory places the well-being and safety of individuals at the center of security concerns, rather than solely focusing on state security (Nemec Zlatolas, et al. [16]). It encompasses issues such as poverty, health, environmental sustainability, and human rights. In the context of public security, human security emphasizes the protection of people from various threats, both traditional and non-traditional.

Critical Security Studies

Critical security studies challenge traditional approaches to security (Kamoun [17]). These theories argue that security is not solely about protecting against external threats but also about power dynamics, inequality, and the securitization of certain issues. In the realm of public security, critical theorists might scrutinize how certain policies are framed as security concerns and the implications of such framing.

Risk and Resilience

This perspective focuses on identifying and managing risks rather than traditional security threats (Furnell [18]). It emphasizes adaptability and preparedness to withstand various challenges, including natural disasters, pandemics, and economic crises. Public security in this context involves enhancing resilience and reducing vulnerabilities.

Multi-Dimensional Security

This concept recognizes that security is not a one-dimensional issue but involves various dimensions, including political, economic, environmental, and social (Huang, et al. [19]). Public security efforts need to address these multifaceted aspects to ensure the well-being and safety of the public. While these are some of the key theories and perspectives related to security, it's essential to note that the application of these theories to public security can vary depending on the specific context, whether at the local, national, or international

level (Hossain [20]). Public security policies and strategies often incorporate elements from multiple theories to address the diverse and evolving challenges faced by societies. Public security is a multidimensional concept that encompasses various dimensions or aspects, as it involves safeguarding the safety, well-being, and rights of individuals and communities within a society. These dimensions of public security are interconnected and often overlap. Some key dimensions of public security:

Physical Security: This dimension involves protecting individuals and property from physical harm, violence, and criminal activities (Kumar [21]). It encompasses efforts to prevent and respond to crimes, including law enforcement, emergency services, and measures to ensure personal safety.

Economic Security: Economic security focuses on maintaining economic stability and prosperity within a society (Laredo [22]). It includes policies and measures aimed at preventing economic crises, promoting employment, and reducing poverty and inequality.

Social Security: Social security addresses the well-being of individuals and communities by providing access to healthcare, education, social services, and a social safety net (Stanciu [23]). It aims to ensure that people have the means to lead fulfilling lives and participate in society.

Health Security: Health security involves protecting public health and well-being. It includes measures to prevent and control the spread of diseases, ensure access to healthcare services, and respond to health emergencies, such as pandemics (Flores Gamboa, et al. [24]).

Environmental Security: Environmental security focuses on safeguarding the environment and natural resources to ensure the sustainability of ecosystems and mitigate the impacts of environmental disasters and climate change (Halaweh [25]).

Cybersecurity: In the digital age, cybersecurity is essential for public security (Chang [26]). It involves protecting critical infrastructure, data, and information systems from cyber threats, hacking, and online crimes.

National Security: National security encompasses measures to protect a country's sovereignty, territorial integrity, and interests from external threats, such as military aggression and terrorism. It includes defense, intelligence, and diplomacy (Budai [27]).

Cultural Security: Cultural security relates to the preservation and promotion of cultural heritage, languages, and identities within a society (Kim, et al. [28]). It seeks to protect against cultural erosion, discrimination, and threats to cultural diversity.

Political Security: Political security involves ensuring the stability of political institutions, democratic processes, and the rule of law (Joewono [29]). It includes measures to prevent political violence, coup attempts, and other threats to the political system.

Community Security: Community security emphasizes building

safe and cohesive communities (Suh [30]). It involves community policing, crime prevention, and social programs that strengthen community bonds and reduce crime.

Food Security: Food security is about ensuring access to safe and nutritious food for all members of society. It addresses issues of hunger, malnutrition, and food supply chain resilience (Dewi [31]).

Energy Security: Energy security involves guaranteeing a reliable and sustainable energy supply for a society (Chellappa [32]). It includes efforts to diversify energy sources, enhance energy efficiency, and reduce dependence on volatile energy markets. These dimensions of public security are interrelated, and effective security policies often require a holistic approach that takes into account multiple aspects (Salisbury, et al. [33]). The specific priorities and challenges related to public security can vary from one region or country to another and may change over time in response to evolving threats and societal needs. Measuring public security can be a complex and multifaceted process, as it involves assessing various dimensions of safety and well-being within a society. While there is no single metric that can comprehensively capture public security, several methods and indicators are commonly used to gauge and evaluate different aspects of public security. Some key approaches to measuring public security:

a. Crime Rates: Monitoring crime rates, including violent crimes (e.g., homicides, assaults) and property crimes (e.g., burglaries, thefts), is a fundamental way to assess public security (Varga [34]). Law enforcement agencies and government organizations typically collect and report crime data, allowing for the comparison of crime levels over time and across regions.

b. Victimization Surveys: Surveys and interviews with the public can provide insights into people's perceptions of safety, their experiences with crime, and their attitudes toward law enforcement and the justice system (Zhang [35]). Victimization surveys help capture underreported crimes and individuals' feelings of security.

c. Emergency Response and Preparedness: Evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of emergency response systems is critical for public security (Mojica, et al. [36]). This includes assessing response times, coordination among agencies, and the availability of resources during disasters and crises.

d. Public Health Indicators: Health-related data, such as mortality rates, morbidity rates, and disease outbreaks, can reflect aspects of public security, especially in the context of health emergencies like pandemics (McFadzean [37]).

e. Environmental Data: Monitoring environmental factors, such as air and water quality, natural disaster occurrence and impacts, and climate change indicators, is crucial for assessing environmental security and its impact on public safety (Strohmeier, et al. [38]).

f. Economic Indicators: Economic security can be measured using indicators like employment rates, poverty levels, income distribution, and economic stability (Aarika, et al. [39]). A stable and prosperous economy often correlates with a higher sense of security among the population.

g. Infrastructure Resilience: Assessing the resilience of critical infrastructure, including transportation networks, power grids, and communication systems, is vital for public security. Infrastructure failures can disrupt daily life and pose safety risks (Palczewska [40]).

h. Cybersecurity Metrics: For assessing cybersecurity, metrics include the number and severity of cyberattacks, data breaches, and the effectiveness of cybersecurity measures in protecting critical systems and data (Čížik [41]).

i. Social and Demographic Data: Analyzing social and demographic trends, such as population growth, urbanization, and migration patterns, can help identify potential security challenges related to population dynamics (Srinivasan [42]).

j. Political Stability: Indicators related to political stability, such as political violence, demonstrations, and changes in government leadership, are important for evaluating public security in terms of political stability and governance (Zakaria [43]).

k. Community Engagement: Measuring the level of community engagement and trust in public institutions, including the police and local government, can provide insights into social cohesion and the effectiveness of community-oriented public security strategies (Adams, et al. [44]).

l. Global Indices: Various organizations, such as the Global Peace Index and the Global Terrorism Index, compile indices that rank countries based on their overall levels of peace and security (Molnár [45]). These indices consider multiple factors to provide a comparative assessment. It's important to note that measuring public security is not a one-size-fits-all endeavor (Shin [46]). The choice of metrics and methods should align with the specific context and goals of the assessment. Comprehensive security assessments often require a combination of quantitative data, qualitative information, and the input of experts and stakeholders to provide a more holistic understanding of public security. Additionally, ongoing monitoring and analysis are essential to track changes in security conditions and the effectiveness of security policies and interventions.

Research Highlights

Highlight 1

The structure of the perception of security is multidimensional in the Covid-19 era (Juarez, et al. [47]).

Highlight 2

The literature review shows seven predominant factors related to: territory, nation, public, citizen, human, private and internet user (Molina, et al. [48]).

Highlight 3

The modeling of the perception of security can be done from 7 factors and 28 indicators (Aldana, et al. [49]).

Research Objectives

The objective of this work is to model the determinants of the perception of security, considering the mitigation and containment policies of the pandemic, mainly the confinement and social distancing strategies.

Methodology

A documentary, cross-sectional and retrospective study was carried out with a sample of 100 references searched in international repositories: Ebsco, Scilit and Scopus, considering the keywords «risk», «security» and «Covid-19». Expert judges in the themes scored selected excerpts in three rounds, assigning them -1 for the safety category and +1 for the insecurity category. The data were processed in SPSS version 20, considering normal distribution, contingencies and probability proportions (Garcia [50,51]). The Public Security Scale was used, which includes 30 items referring to governance, identity, trust, transparency, reputation, isomorphism and image. Each item includes five response options ranging from 0 = «not at all likely» to 5 = «quite likely.» Reliability reached the minimum essential values of 0.60 for omega and alpha (0.768 and 0.789 respectively). the adequacy reached values between 0.341 and 0.760 as well as sphericity with the Bartlett test of $[X^2 = 2279.233 (435 \text{ df}) p < 0.001]$. Validity ranged between 0.417 and 0.994). Respondents were selected considering their participation in the system of professional practices and social service in local public security institutions. The confidentiality and anonymity of their responses was guaranteed in writing, with prior informed consent regarding the objectives and those responsible for the study, as well as non-remuneration for their responses. They were organized into focus groups to discuss the meaning of the variables.

They were organized using the Delphi technique in three rounds in order to evaluate the contents of the scale. The surveys were administered in the classrooms of the public university. The information was captured in Excel and processed in JASP version 14. The parameters of reliability, adequacy, sphericity, validity, correlation, adjustment and residual were estimated. Values close to unity were considered as evidence of failure to support the hypothesis.

Results

A robust structure of relationships was established between the factors and indicators related to public security and in relation to

the effect of the media framing on news related to the problem. This model showed that seven psychological factors prevail with respect to 30 indicators that measure the multidimensionality of security (Table 1). The first factor related to governance explained the highest percentage of variance (0.076), followed by the dimension of identity (0.066), trust (0.055), transparency (0.049), reputation (0.040), isomorphism (0.030) and image (0.031) (Table 2). The governance factor was associated with reputation (0.213), identity with trust

(0.408), transparency with reputation (0.184), reputation with identity (0.374), isomorphism with reputation (0.295), and image with reputation (0.159) (Table 3). The adjustment values [$\chi^2 = 461.876$ (246 df) $p < 0.001$; TLI = 0.789; RMSEA = 0.057] suggest the rejection of the null hypothesis related to the significant differences between the theoretical structure of security reported in the literature with respect to the observations made in the present work.

Table 1: Factor loadings.

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Uniqueness
r1				0.743				0.476
r2				0.915				0.134
r3								0.959
r4								0.855
r5								0.75
r6					0.518			0.62
r7		0.468						0.766
r8								0.75
r9			0.443					0.769
r10					0.417			0.805
r11		0.496						0.72
r12								0.75
r13								0.746
r14			0.561					0.682
r15			0.717					0.52
r16								0.955
r17			0.412					0.839
r18		1.04						0.025
r19								0.907
r20					0.411			0.699
r21								0.753
r22	0.539							0.68
r23	0.994							-0.008
r24	0.866							0.22
r25								0.944
r26						0.712		0.526
r27						0.613		0.681
r28								0.908
r29							-0.529	0.701
r30							0.715	0.456

Note: Applied rotation method is promax.

Table 2: Factor Characteristics.

	SumSq. Loadings	Proportion var.	Cumulative
Factor 1	2.284	0.076	0.076
Factor 2	1.972	0.066	0.142
Factor 3	1.639	0.055	0.196
Factor 4	1.476	0.049	0.246
Factor 5	1.202	0.04	0.286
Factor 6	0.912	0.03	0.316
Factor 7	0.93	0.031	0.347

Table 3: Factor Correlations.

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Factor 1	Factor 2	-0.091	-0.038	0.107	0.213	0.06	0.103
Factor 2	Factor 3	1	0.408	0.075	0.374	-0.085	0.048
Factor 3	Factor 4	0.408	1	0.135	0.116	-0.15	-0.112
Factor 4	Factor 5	0.075	0.135	1	0.184	-0.147	0.034
Factor 5	Factor 6	0.374	0.116	0.184	1	0.295	0.159
Factor 6	Factor 7	-0.085	-0.15	-0.147	0.295	1	0.058
Factor 7	0.103	0.048	-0.112	0.034	0.159	0.058	1

Findings

The robustness of a model of reflective relationships that make up a security structure from the subjectivity of the interested parties was demonstrated, as well as the validity of the instrument in order to be able to compare the results of the study in other scenarios and analysis samples.

References

- Huang DL, Rau PLP, Salvendy G (2010) Perception of information security. *Behaviour & Information Technology* 29(3): 221-232.
- Leung GC (2011) China's energy security: perception and reality. *Energy Policy* 39(3): 1330-1337.
- Balapour A, Nikkhah HR, Sabherwal R (2020) Mobile application security: Role of perceived privacy as the predictor of security perceptions. *International Journal of Information Management* 52: 102063.
- Meskaran F, Ismail Z, Shanmugam B (2013) Online purchase intention: Effects of trust and security perception. *Australian journal of basic and applied sciences* 7(6): 307-315.
- Van Gelder JL (2009) Legal tenure security, perceived tenure security and housing improvement in Buenos Aires: an attempt towards integration. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33(1): 126-146.
- Evans D, Paul N (2004) Election security: Perception and reality. *IEEE Security & Privacy* 2(1): 24-31.
- Greco F, Polli A (2021) Security perception and people well-being. *Social Indicators Research* 153(2): 741-758.
- Gaufman E (2017) *Security threats and public perception*. Cham: Springer.
- Chen Y, Zahedi FM (2016) Individuals' internet security perceptions and behaviors. *Mis Quarterly* 40(1): 205-222.
- Coppola P, Silvestri F (2020) Assessing travelers' safety and security perception in railway stations. Case studies on transport policy 8(4): 1127-1136.
- Gull H, Saeed S, Iqbal SZ, Bamarouf YA, Alqahtani MA, et al. (2022) An empirical study of mobile commerce and customers security perception in Saudi Arabia. *Electronics* 11(3): 293.
- Khattak HA, Shah MA, Khan S, Ali I, Imran M, et al. (2019) Perception layer security in Internet of Things. *Future Generation Computer Systems* 100: 144-164.
- Baraković S, Baraković Husić J, Maraj D, Maraj A, Krejcar O, et al. (2020) Quality of life, quality of experience, and security perception in web of things: An overview of research opportunities. *Electronics* 9(4): 700.
- Halaweh M (2012) Integration of grounded theory and case study: An exemplary application from e-commerce security perception research. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application (JITTA)* 13(1): 3.
- Kříž Z (2021) The security perception and security policy of the Czech Republic, 1993-2018. *Defense & security analysis* 37(1): 38-52.
- Nemec Zlatolas L, Feher N, Hölbl M (2022) Security perception of IoT devices in smart homes. *Journal of Cybersecurity and Privacy* 2(1): 65-73.
- Kamoun F, Halaweh M (2012) User interface design and e-commerce security perception: An empirical study. *International Journal of E-Business Research (IJEER)* 8(2): 15-32.
- Furnell SM, Bryant P, Phippen AD (2007) Assessing the security perceptions of personal Internet users. *Computers & Security* 26(5): 410-417.
- Huang DL, Rau PLP, Salvendy G, Gao F, Zhou J, et al. (2011) Factors affecting perception of information security and their impacts on IT adoption and security practices. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 69(12): 870-883.
- Hossain MA (2019) Security perception in the adoption of mobile payment

- and the moderating effect of gender. *PSU Research Review* 3(3): 179-190.
21. Kumar M, Gupta S (2020) Security perception of e-banking users in India: An analytical hierarchy process. *Banks and Bank Systems* 15(1): 11.
22. Laredo MMM, Huante CGÁ, Gandarilla JV (2017) Percepción de la atención de enfermería y satisfacción laboral en un Hospital de Seguridad Social/ Perception of nursing care and job satisfaction in a Social Security Hospital. *RICSH Revista Iberoamericana de las Ciencias Sociales y Humanísticas* 6(11): 287-312.
23. Stanciu V, Tinca A (2016) Students' awareness on information security between own perception and reality—an empirical study. *Accounting and Management Information Systems* 15(1): 112-130.
24. Flores Gamboa S, Mariño Jiménez J, León Santiesteban M, Liz A (2016) Percepción De Seguridad Del Turismo Extranjero Que Arriba En Casas Rodantes a Playas De Mazatlán (Sinaloa) (Security Perception of Foreigners Who Travel in House Trailers at Mazatlan Beaches (Sinaloa)). *Revista Turismo y Sociedad* (19).
25. Halaweh M, Fidler C (2008) Security perception in e-commerce: Conflict between customer and organizational perspectives. In *2008 International Multiconference on Computer Science and Information Technology*, pp. 443-449.
26. Chang HH, Chen SW (2009) Consumer perception of interface quality, security, and loyalty in electronic commerce. *Information & management* 46(7): 411-417.
27. Budai Á (2021) The security perception and security policy of Hungary, 1989–2018. *Defense & Security Analysis* 37(1): 9-22.
28. Kim C, Tao W, Shin N, Kim KS (2010) An empirical study of customers' perceptions of security and trust in e-payment systems. *Electronic commerce research and applications* 9(1): 84-95.
29. Joewono TB, Kubota H (2006) Safety and security improvement in public transportation based on public perception in developing countries. *IATSS research* 30(1): 86-100.
30. Suh B, Han I (2003) The impact of customer trust and perception of security control on the acceptance of electronic commerce. *International Journal of electronic commerce* 7(3): 135-161.
31. Dewi CR, Darma GS (2014) Website usability, satisfaction, loyalty, security perception, trust and word of mouth in e-commerce business. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis* 11(2): 1-30.
32. Chellappa R, Pavlou PA (2002) Perceived information security, financial liability and consumer trust in electronic commerce transactions. *Logistics Information Management* 15(5/6): 358-368.
33. Salisbury WD, Pearson RA, Pearson AW, Miller DW (2001) Perceived security and World Wide Web purchase intention. *Industrial Management & Data Systems* 101(4): 165-177.
34. Varga TC (2021) Security perception and security policy in Central Europe, 1989–2019. *Defense & Security Analysis* 37(1): 1-8.
35. Zhang J, Luximon Y, Song Y (2019) The role of consumers' perceived security, perceived control, interface design features, and conscientiousness in continuous use of mobile payment services. *Sustainability* 11(23): 6843.
36. Mojica ÉB, Rincón OC, González MDR, Lirios CG, Ugarte AVB, et al. (2023) Contrast a model of security perception in the Covid-19 era. *Encuentros multidisciplinares* 25(73): 15.
37. McFadzean E, Ezingear JN, Birchall D (2007) Perception of risk and the strategic impact of existing IT on information security strategy at board level. *Online Information Review* 31(5): 622-660.
38. Strohmeier M, Schäfer M, Pinheiro R, Lenders V, Martinovic I, et al. (2016). On perception and reality in wireless air traffic communication security. *IEEE transactions on intelligent transportation systems* 18(6): 1338-1357.
39. Aarika K, Bouhhal M, Abdelouahid RA, Elfilali S, Benlahmar E, et al. (2020) Perception layer security in the internet of things. *Procedia Computer Science* 175: 591-596.
40. Palczewska M (2021) The security perception and security policy of Poland, 1989–2017. *Defense & Security Analysis* 37(1): 80-95.
41. Čížik T (2021) Security perception and security policy of the Slovak Republic, 1993–2018. *Defense & Security Analysis* 37(1): 23-37.
42. Srinivasan S, Bhat CR, Holguin-Veras J (2006) Empirical analysis of the impact of security perception on intercity mode choice: A panel rank-ordered mixed logit model. *Transportation Research Record* 1942(1): 9-15.
43. Zakaria O (2005) Employee security perception in cultivating information security culture. In *Security Management, Integrity, and Internal Control in Information Systems: IFIP TC-11 WG 11.1 & WG 11.5 Joint Working Conference Springer US* 7, p. 83-92.
44. Adams D, Bah A, Barwulor C, Musaby N, Pitkin K, et al. (2018) Ethics emerging: the story of privacy and security perceptions in virtual reality. In *Fourteenth Symposium on Usable Privacy and Security (SOUPS 2018)*, pp. 427-442.
45. Molnár TL (2021) The security perception and security policy of Austria, 1989–2017. *Defense & Security Analysis* 37(1): 66-79.
46. Shin DH (2010) The effects of trust, security and privacy in social networking: A security-based approach to understand the pattern of adoption. *Interacting with computers* 22(5): 428-438.
47. Juarez M, Carreon J, Quintero ML, Espinoza F, Busto JM, et al. (2017) Reliability and validity of an instrument that measures dimension a security and risk perception in student at a public university. *International Journal of Advances in Social Science and Humanities* 11(12): 23-13.
48. Molinav MR, Coronado O, Garcia C, Quiroz CY (2021) Contrast a model security perception in the Covid-19 era. *Journal of Community Medicine and public Health Care* 8(1): 77-83.
49. Aldana WI, Sanchez R, Garcia C (2020) La estructura de la percepción de inseguridad pública. *Tlatemoani* 34 (1): 1-15.
50. Garcia C (2019) Exploratory factor structure of the security public. *International Systems Journal* 23 (1): 82-86.
51. Garcia C (2020) Specification of a model for study of insecurity systems. *Global Journal of Management & Business Research* 20(1): 7-10.

ISSN: 2574-1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2023.54.008527

Cruz García-Lirios. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License

Submission Link: <https://biomedres.us/submit-manuscript.php>



Assets of Publishing with us

- Global archiving of articles
- Immediate, unrestricted online access
- Rigorous Peer Review Process
- Authors Retain Copyrights
- Unique DOI for all articles

<https://biomedres.us/>