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Abstract

The commercial manned guarding sector of private security continues to grow, outnumbering public policing. Underlying drivers include government austerity measures leading to more reliance on the private sector, outsourcing, crime and the fear of crime. Unfortunately, the sector is often unable to attract the best candidates since it is rarely viewed as a viable career option. Internationally, private security has been subject to increasing regulation for the purpose of raising standards and, in turn, public confidence. However, the sector lacks the key elements of a structured career path, and there have been few endeavors to establish the foundations of one to support the professionalism of private security.

This study assesses the current picture within the sector and seeks to identify the elements required to develop the foundations of a structured career path. The research involved a qualitative method, adopting a grounded theory approach. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with private security sector representatives internationally. The study established that structured career paths do not currently exist, with a number of barriers inhibiting progression. The research identified the need both for progression based on training and education, and the sector to strive to be a profession of its own representing the key element required as the foundation to devising career pathways.
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### List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIS</td>
<td>American Society of Industrial Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQF</td>
<td>Australian Qualification Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIFM</td>
<td>British Institute of Facilities Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV</td>
<td>Closed Circuit Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMES</td>
<td>Competence Evaluation Method for European Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoESS</td>
<td>Confederation of European Security Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>College of Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Charted Insurance Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMA</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Management Accountants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPD</td>
<td>Chartered Institute of Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISO</td>
<td>Chief Information Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRISP</td>
<td>Construction Research and Innovation Strategy Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSyP</td>
<td>Chartered Security Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Chief Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>Certified Protection Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECVET</td>
<td>European Credit System for Vocational Education &amp; Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQF</td>
<td>European Qualification Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Facility Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURM</td>
<td>Future Retail Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCMA</td>
<td>Global Chartered Management Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Human Recourse Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIP</td>
<td>Investor in People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISPT</td>
<td>Interim Security Professionals Taskforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOSH</td>
<td>Institution of Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSAs</td>
<td>Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBOSH</td>
<td>National Examination Board in Occupational Safety and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ</td>
<td>National Framework of Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQs</td>
<td>National Vocational Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRF</td>
<td>National Retail Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQF</td>
<td>Policing Education Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFA</td>
<td>Qualified Financial Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQI</td>
<td>Quality Qualifications Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPL</td>
<td>Recognition of Prior Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SII</td>
<td>Security Institute of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRM</td>
<td>Security Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNPF</td>
<td>Turkish National Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAFC</td>
<td>Western Association of Food Chains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Glossary of Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Path</td>
<td>A strategy to support workers’ development through their working life that allows them move upwards and sideways and comprises training and education as a key component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Security Sector</td>
<td>The non-government profit making security provider sector that provides security guarding, hardware, technology and specialist services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>The proven ability to do something successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Having the necessary blend of knowledge, skills, ability, qualifications, experience and attitude to do something successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Model</td>
<td>A framework for defining the skills and knowledge requirements of a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Security Manager</td>
<td>A manager of security guarding services in the commercial security sector who oversees the contracts with a number of clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Security Manager</td>
<td>A senior executive manager employed directly by a corporation with responsibility for security throughout the organization. Such a manager is also an end user of goods and services from the commercial security sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Security Officer (CSO)</td>
<td>An alternative job title of the corporate security manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
<td>An inductive research method of the social sciences that generates a theory from qualitative data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Security</td>
<td>Security personnel who work directly for an organisation and are part of the corporate security department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manned Guarding Sector</td>
<td>The segment of the commercial security sector that provides security guards and managers to organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Boundary and Professional Closure</td>
<td>A key competent of professionalism based on the premise that those who work within a occupation or want to gain entry to an occupation should provide evidence of being suitably qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Security</td>
<td>The non-governmental, private sector practice of protecting people, property, and information, conducting investigations, and otherwise safeguarding organizations assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>A knowledge-based occupation grounded in specialist education, training and continuing professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionality</td>
<td>The competence or skill required of a professional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Relating to or belonging to a profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications Framework</td>
<td>Used to classify and compare qualifications, identifying the qualification levels associated with different degrees of professional competence and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 - Introduction

Background

The world continues to evolve and, accordingly, so does the emerging risk that comes with its evolution. Organizations have to respond to organizational risks and to what American politician and former Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld (2002), referred to as ‘known unknowns’ in a famous quote:

… there are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns – the ones we don't know we don't know.

He refers to the latter category as being the most difficult to manage. These, in an ever-changing world, are challenging organizations’ risk management capability. However, they are also fostering career path opportunities in security risk management. Talbot and Jakeman (2011) observe that risks are now more complex than ever before, and that as the nature of work, travel, recreation and communication is continuously changing, the past is less and less a guide for the future. One of the key challenges is for security risk management professionals to keep current with an ever-changing security risk management portfolio that is becoming more and more difficult to manage.

There is very little academic material on early private security, and one of the few examples relates to the American picture and the Ford Motor Company. Industrialization developed manufacturing plants in the early 20th century, and plant security became a feature. Henry Ford is credited with creating the first organizational, in-house security force of private police actors (Hess, 2008) at the Ford Motoring Company. Subsequent World Wars saw private security further develop to protect munitions plants. The Cold War that followed saw a plethora of security managers emerge with a mandate for safeguarding organizational assets through loss prevention programmes.

In-house organizational security management has since evolved into what are referred to today as corporate security departments (Lippert et al., 2013). Globalization has helped corporations expand beyond their home countries and operate worldwide (Briggs and Edwards, 2006). This in turn is presenting security challenges associated with crime,
information technology, fraud, natural disasters and terrorism (Borodzicz and Gibson, 2006). Indeed it is the same infrastructure benefiting business that is also facilitating the transcending of borders by organised crime and terrorist activities (Bloomberg and Rosendorff, 2006). Major corporate scandals of the last two decades such as WorldCom, Deepwater Horizon, Lehman Brothers and the recent Volkswagen emissions case have affected the environment, the safety of workers and the economy (Osofsky, 2013). This has led to increased public outcry and organizations having to internally control their activities and demonstrate good governance and corporate social responsibility (Tricker, 2015), thus creating a growth spurt in the number of corporate security managers, or as also referred to as the CSO (Chief Security Officer) (Brooks and Corkill, 2014).

Corporate security has transformed in the 20th century. Dalton (2003:21) describes this transformation, referring to stages of security management development in phases. The first phase, the ‘green shack’ era, depicted a time when someone asking for security within the organization would be directed to a little green shack, highlighting the low position security held in organizations and the low status of security personnel. The second phase, the ‘physical security’ era, was when organizations began to focus on the aspect of loss prevention. The focus was on protection of tangible assets at points of entry and egress. The third phase, the ‘corporate security’ era, was when units were referred to as corporate security departments and took on a wider remit. In this era corporate security began to be factored into business plans. Dalton’s last phase, the ‘total asset protection’ era, is one in which protection of tangible and intangible assets in addition to a global outlook characterized corporate security.

As Walby and Lippert (2014) observe, every employee and every object and fragment of information can be seen as both an asset and a risk. Thus, corporate and organizational interests align with security and security managers have a key role to play in executive decision making. As they point out, this development has seen the CEO having new company at the board table in the form of the CSO who oversees the corporate security team and is considered integral to the organization’s overall strategic plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Green Shack Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Physical Security Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Corporate Security Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Total Asset Protection Era</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Dalton’s Four Stages of Security Management Development

Corporate security is no longer seen solely within private corporations. As Walby and Lippert (2014) observe there is also a slow transformation of corporate security into public and government bodies, what they refer to as the corporate security creep.

The transformation of security management has created career path opportunities at senior management level. The in-house security management function has evolved from the traditional ‘locks and bolts’ security role to a wider security risk management one. This is expanding and changing the security manager’s portfolio and challenging their ability to prevent, protect and recover. Moreover, as Talbot and Jakeman (2011) point out, CSOs are being tasked with showing organizations how to take calculated risk, moving away from the traditional guards, guns and gates model that some may be more comfortable applying. This is having important implications for the training and development of security managers.

Maslow (1948) referred to security as a fundamental personal need. However, security has now become a commodity that is bought and sold. In the earlier eras of security management frontline security officers were part of the in-house function. Today, organizational security no longer typically employs large frontline in-house security teams; instead, a hybrid security management model has developed (White, 2015). The corporate security management team remains part of the in-house function while, for reasons of cost effectiveness, frontline roles are typically outsourced to the commercial security sector (Brooks and Corkill, 2014). The commercial security sector has thus become a huge benefactor in this outsourcing movement, a key trend of recent decades that has applied globally across a range of non-core business activities in the private and public sectors (White, 2016). Outsourcing examples include event security at large concerts, theme parks and sporting stadia, retail shopping outlets, manufacturing plants, banks, air and sea ports, cash and valuables in transit, state and semi-state building and facility security such as
offices, museums, schools, colleges and universities, prisons, police stations, and security at critical infrastructures (White, 2016; White, 2010; Prenzler, 2013).

Internationally, commercial security has become one of the largest service industries, comprising hardware, technology and manned guarding sectors. The manned guarding sector, the focus of this study, is estimated to employ up to 25 million manned security guards globally, according to Nalla and Wakefield (2014). This means it vastly outnumbers the police in most countries (van Steden and de Waard, 2013). The international association for security practitioners, ASIS (2013:2), estimates a $410 billion annual market in the United States alone. The Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS) Facts and Figures report estimates that the European manned guarding sector turned over €35 billion in 2010, employing 2,170,589 security officers (2011:143-144).

The growth of private security following the Second World War has accelerated due to a variety of social, political and economic factors (Nalla and Wakefield, 2014). Reasons for its growth can be attributed to a variety of factors. These include rising crime, rising fear of crime (Cunningham and Taylor, 1985) and the continued growth of mass private property since the 1960s. We have come to rely on private security officers being employed to enforce regulations on private property (Stenning, 1994; Wakefield, 2003). Further reasons for its flourishing includes economic growth in first, second and third world countries (Kaufmann et al., 2006) and technological advancements making security products cheaper and more effective in combating crime (van Steden and de Waard, 2013) while, post 9/11, security is now high on most boardroom agendas (Briggs and Edwards, 2006). Most recently, private security growth has been sustained by the continued Western neo-liberal austerity government mandate of outsourcing policing functions to the private sector (White, 2010) and commercial organizations outsourcing non-core functions such as security (Nalla and Wakefield, 2014): business-savvy entrepreneurs have taken the opportunity presented by cost cutting to capitalize on providing private security options (White and Gill, 2013).

This growth has created an enormous service industry providing services that include contract security officers and management, investigations, and training and consulting services (van Steden and de Waard, 2013). Private security is a fragmented industry, though, with tens of thousands of small and medium-sized suppliers worldwide that provide their services through contract security, that is, specialized services and products.
provided on a profit basis (van Steden and de Waard, 2013). Commercial contract security firms provide services in wide ranging environments, and have the ability to provide specialized services not always found in-house (Manzo, 2006) or in state provision (White and Gill, 2013). They have come to supplement the state in its policing provision and contributed to the evolution of police functions. As Kezeli (2016) observes, private security personnel on a cooperative contract basis have filled the gaps in staffing requirements in both state and federal agencies and have helped reshape modern policing functions. There is no sign of a slowdown in the increasing influence of private security in policing. Kezeli (2016) observes that contracting agencies are increasingly asking private security providers to take on more policing responsibilities.

However, with all the opportunity that has been created for private security from outsourcing and in undertaking policing functions, commercial security providers have not typically developed their employees to meet this demand. Borodzicz and Gibson (2006) observe that jobs in the building and catering trades were once seen as low entry level and easy to get and that the trades employed unskilled staff. They suggest that the commercial security sector has replaced building and catering as one of the great employers of unskilled staff. White and Gill (2013) scathingly assert that they are more interested in profits than protecting the public interest.

The increased standards that do exist within the sector are the result of industry associations lobbying government for regulation from the 1960s (White, 2010). UK and Irish lobbying of government occurred until the sector was finally regulated in the early and mid-noughties respectively following enactment of legislation to raise standards and remove criminal involvement and activity within the sector (Button and George, 2006). However, academic critics have argued that this lobbying of government was about achieving a state policing services stamp that creates a perception of professionalism among buyers and society, rather than being in the public interest (White, 2010; White and Gill, 2013; Button and George, 2006).

Part of the regulation mandate is to ensure mandatory training of security officers before they can take up employment (Button, 2011). In most European countries security personnel are subject to regulation and required to undergo mandatory training, although there is great variance among countries in their training requirements. A report by the Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS) (2011) has shown that the required
training hours in different jurisdictions range from 28 to 320. Some countries, such as Spain, have progressive regulatory regimes that include ongoing refresher training although this is the exception rather than the norm.

In most countries (the Nordic countries and Spain being notable exceptions), there is a general feeling that regulation has been unsuccessful in its mandate and had limited positive impact in attracting and retaining personnel of strong calibre. This is particularly true of the British sector according to Button and George (2006), where research by Gill et al. (2013) suggests that purchasers of security are generally dissatisfied with the levels of training of security guards. Their study also discusses the sector’s problem with high staff turnover and found that the top reasons cited for leaving the sector were poor pay and conditions, lack of recognition, and limited opportunities for career development and progression. In a comparative study of British and Swedish security guards, Lofstrand et al. (2015) found that security officers saw their roles as heavily stigmatized and suffered from low self-esteem.

If the security sector is to develop and professionalize, it is clear that it needs to attract well-equipped, motivated individuals at entry level, manage them effectively and develop them adequately. Employees need to feel valued and empowered, with prospects for progression. Cao and Thomas (2013) identify training, education and lifelong learning (LLL) as key elements of a career path. It is clear that the sector lacks these elements as a foundational structure. Identifying what this structure should be may assist in supporting the competence levels of security personnel in meeting security’s strategic goal of safeguarding people and property in an ever-changing world that is full of uncertainty. In turn, it may result in increased perceptions of the sector, enhance the quality of service in the public interest and, to those who pay, harness the best employees, while also supporting the professionalism of the sector.

**Research Aims**

Taking account of these persistent inadequacies in private security services, the aim of this research is to devise a structured career path to inform entry to, and progression within, the manned guarding sector. The specific focus is on human resources of the private security sector, specifically the security officers, security managers and consultants found in contract and corporate security.
The research is structured around three main research questions:

1. How well developed are career paths within the manned guarding sector?
2. What models exist inside and outside the security sector to inform the design of workable career structures?
3. What should be the main foundations of a well-focused career path?

Outline of Chapters

The thesis is laid out as follows. Firstly, chapter two outlines the empirical research methodology and argues the case for the grounded theory approach that was employed: an inductive strategy utilizing qualitative data collection methods. The chapter outlines the literature search and selection strategy, as well as the empirical research design and process based on semi-structured interviews with an international sample of sector participants drawn from Ireland, the UK, Spain, Germany, Italy, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and America. Additionally, the chapter sets out the ethical considerations that informed the empirical research process, the application of the grounded theory approach to the data analysis and development of a theoretical framework. Also discussed is the researcher’s experience of doing the research.

Chapter three draws on the literature in the area of career paths and private security. It begins by offering working definitions of these concepts. It then identifies how the sector has grown, looking at the numbers working in manned guarding and their backgrounds. Subsequently, perceptions of the manned guarding sector are considered and how it is regulated before the chapter closes with a discussion.

In chapter four, the current career path picture within the sector is assessed, drawing on empirical data gathered from interviewees. The chapter begins by considering how well developed security career paths are today, discussing the roles and responsibilities and the availability, relevance and adequacy of training and education. The typical sector practitioner background is identified, inclusive of frontline security guards and managers. The chapter then examines the barriers to progression before concluding with a discussion.

Chapter five examines what the sector needs to do to devise the foundations of a structured career path, drawing on empirical data from the research participants. Chapter five highlights the organizational security management needs to address contemporary risk concerns and challenges which, it is argued, in turn require a new form of manager and
leader. Further discussed is the need to adopt the key elements of a career pathway while also adopting the elements of a profession to support the development of a progression route supported by sector stakeholders. Subsequently, the chapter presents other career path models that may be suitable for adoption before closing with a discussion.

Chapter six considers how the sector should progress devising the foundations of a career path. Developing a competency model and a qualifications framework that provides a structured progression career path that gives for a transparent model of hiring and promotion is seen as the way to move forward. A key element highlighted as the means of developing this is for consensus and collaboration of sector stakeholders coming together to develop the career path model that is underpinned by a body of knowledge created through scientific research.

Chapter seven represents the conclusion of the thesis and summarizes the key research findings and the implication of these for the sector and society as a whole. It looks to address the gaps in security career paths by providing an eight point actions plan to develop career paths and proposes a hierarchy progression model and competency statements for each of these roles. These action plan points, if progressed, should help address the organizational risk to business and risk to society caused by the lack of driven security practitioners and help raise the perception of security as a career by providing occupational boundary and professional closure. The proposed competency statements also provide a starting point to develop learning outcomes that address the skills needed by today’s security practitioners and give the sector more credibility as a distinct profession and its own management discipline. It is concluded that the sector needs to come together and create a body of knowledge to do this.
Chapter 2 - Research Methodology

Introduction
This chapter describes the research design process, the methodology borne out of the design and the methods used for data collection. As the research adopted a grounded theory approach, this chapter explains why grounded theory is relevant to this study. The chapter begins by explaining the research design and why a deductive approach was not possible and explains the reason for adopting a grounded theory approach. This is followed by describing the research methods that were applied and detailing how the international sample interviewees were chosen. How the data was analyzed is then presented and explains the open, axial and selective coding stages. Next, is the research experience that discusses the positives, negatives and frustrations of the study, before the chapter closes with a conclusion.

The Research Design
Previous research on devising private security career paths does not exist; therefore, adopting a deductive approach and testing existing theories was not possible. An inductive approach was therefore an appropriate way to investigate this topic, and a grounded theory methodology was adopted utilizing qualitative data collection methods.

Grounded theory aims to arrive at theories from no preconceived ideas about the phenomenon under study (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Patton (1980) observes that the patterns, themes and categories of analysis come from the data as opposed to being imposed on them prior to previous data collection and analysis. As a qualitative method, grounded theory provides the researcher with a unique tool for theoretical development, and by using grounded theory the researcher is afforded the luxury of maintaining an open mind and allowing the data to inform the discovery of data (Jones et al. 2005).

In grounded theory, Dunne (2011) implies that the researcher is not focused on testing hypotheses taken from existing theoretical frameworks. Instead, they develop a new theory grounded in empirical data collected in the field and, as such, these data are deliberately privileged above extant theoretical concepts. The overall aim of grounded theorists according to Yee (2001) is the desire to know what is going on, looking at areas that have either never been studied before or those that are inundated with disparate theories. In a study by Glaser and Strauss (1965) of patients’ awareness of dying in the 1960s,
quantitative methods were not suitable for their research as the study of patients’ and relatives’ awareness of dying had not yet been uncovered. They held a view that the expectation of death by the dying and their relatives was a key to understanding the interactions of those people. The differences between an infant and an adult’s awareness would be different. To understand these perceptions, they studied various hospitals, patients and relatives to allow them to compare various kinds of expectations. It was the result of this study that became the published *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967). For this research, and the perspective of this study, research on devising structured career paths within the manned guarding sector of private security has not been conducted before; therefore, grounded theory fits well with the objectives of the research.

Another aspect that must fit with the research design is how the researcher views the world (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). Gilbert (2008) notes the importance of discerning a philosophical position before the researcher begins to conceptualize the research study. Furthermore, he observes that reflecting on these beliefs and feelings allows the researcher to make research methodology decisions. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) note that all research is interpretive and guided by the researcher’s set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood, and therefore grounded with reference to the philosophical perspectives of ontology and epistemology that determine the methodology of the research. Krauss (2005:758) clarifies that ‘ontology involves the philosophy of reality; epistemology addresses how we come to know that reality; while methodology identifies the particular practices used to attain knowledge of it’. These are anchored in four scientific paradigms as summarised in Table 2.1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
<th>Critical Theory</th>
<th>Realism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Reality is real and apprehensible</td>
<td>Multiple local and specific “constructed” realities</td>
<td>“Virtual” reality shaped by social, economic, ethnic, political, cultural, and gender values, crystallised over time</td>
<td>Reality is “real” but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehensible and so triangulation from many sources is required to try to know it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Findings true – researcher is objective by viewing reality through a “one-way mirror”</td>
<td>Created findings – researcher is a “passionate participant” within the world being investigated</td>
<td>Value mediated findings – researcher is a “transformative intellectual” who changes the social world within which participants live</td>
<td>Findings probably true – researcher is value-aware and needs to triangulate any perceptions he or she is collecting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Methodologies</td>
<td>Mostly concerns with a testing of theory. Thus mainly quantitative methods such as: survey, experiments, and verification of hypotheses</td>
<td>In-depth unstructured interviews, participant observation, action research, and grounded theory research</td>
<td>Action research and participant Observation</td>
<td>Mainly qualitative methods such as case studies and convergent interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Four Scientific Paradigms (Sobh and Perry, 2006:1195)

Fundamental to all these is the question of how knowledge is created. In the positivist paradigm a quantitative approach is utilized and it is generated using statistics of an easily accessible reality (Gilbert, 2008). In the realist paradigm, Yin (2011) explains that the goal is to speculate to theoretical concepts and not to populations. Charmaz (2008) informs us that in both the constructivist and critical theory paradigms it is not possible for generalization of the findings of one study about perception to another’s hypothesis about reality. As Guba and Lincoln (1994) point out, in both these paradigms research results are connected to a person’s view of the world and develop a world of several constructed realities.
Gilbert (2008) identifies two theoretical perspectives in social sciences, positivism and interpretivism, and both are in contrast to each other. Grounded theory places its emphasis on the social construction of reality (Charmaz, 2006) and the social construction of reality is the essential concept of the interpretive perspective (Flick, 2002). Charmaz (2014) reminds us that a key element of the qualitative paradigm is to give research participants a voice and allow them to be the storyteller. My epistemology is that of an Interpretivist, and believe that the reality is multiple and relative (Flick, 2002). According to Carson et al. (2001) interpretivists stay clear of the firm research frameworks associated with positivism, instead selecting an alternative versatile research structure that is flexible enough to capture the explanation in human interaction and comprehending what is understood as reality. An interpretivist goes into the field having a form of part awareness of the research subject, yet supposes that this is an insufficient basis to advance a firm research design as a result of the intricate, numerous and uncertain essence of what is understood as reality (Charmaz, 2014).

Flick (2002) indicates that the researcher stays open to fresh information as the story matures, informed by the research participants. Guba and Lincoln (1994) assert that such a budding and participative method is compatible with the interpretivist belief that people can adapt and cannot hold previous assumptions of time and context-bound social realities. The aim, then, of an interpretivist study is not to predict causes and effects, but instead to interpret the meaning of human behaviour (Sarantakos, 1998). For them it is necessary that they comprehend motives, meanings, reasons and other subjective experiences that are time and context bound (Gilbert, 2008; Sobh and Perry; 2006; Charmaz, 2014).

**The Research Methods**

Typically, as argued by Yin (2010), with most research methods a literature review is carried out prior to conducting primary research. However, this study did not begin with a literature review since the proponents of grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss (1967a), advocate that the literature review and empirical research should be conducted simultaneously throughout the research, while constantly comparing and analyzing the results and conceptualizing commonality themes and meaning from these.

This is because grounded theory begins with no preconceived notions or ideas on the topic, according to Charmaz and Belgrave (2002); literature is reviewed in conjunction with interviews so no bias creeps in, thus allowing the study to flow in its own natural direction.
(Charmaz, 2014). Strauss and Corbin (1998) indicate that analysis of the empirical data is not guided by the literature review; instead, the researcher is looking for the interplay between the literature and the empirical data. Glaser and Strauss (1967a) highlight this as a notable element of grounded theory. As the theory begins and common themes start to develop, the researcher identifies the interviewees who meet the specific criteria for further data collection (Henwood and Pidgeon, 2004). Despite this, the next chapter conceptualizes career paths and private security and in order to do this an initial review of the related literature was required to focus the study rather than direct it. Charmaz (2014) argues that in practice there is always some form of a literature review conducted prior to any empirical research being undertaken, since, prior to the start of the research, a research proposal is typically required. What she emphasizes is that the literature referred to in the early stages of the research may not always be the same literature that forms the analytical process. For this study this was generally the case.

The conceptualizing chapter was necessary to understand and define career paths and private security from the beginning in order to inform the focus of the study, and this was particularly important due to the definitional dilemma that exists in the world of private security (Brooks, 2010). This stage involved reviewing available literature on what a career path is, what we mean when we speak about private security, how it has grown, who works in it, and how it is perceived inside and outside the sector. A literature review was also conducted throughout the empirical data collection stage. The purpose of this literature review was to conduct an analysis of previous research, ideas and opinions, followed by identifying the theoretical and conceptual foundations of this research based on a separate critical analysis of other research and comparing it with the data collected through interviews.

In conducting the literature review, all data that becomes available to the researcher in grounded theory is data according to Strauss and Corbin (1990). This includes secondary data sources. The secondary data sources that were reviewed and analysed comprised both paper-based and electronic sources, and encompassed books, journals, abstracts, research reports, market reports, newspapers, magazines, prescribed private security legislation and security and education training manuals. All these sources cannot be seen to have the same standing and value. Some of these represent academic literature, whereas others are better described as grey material reflecting a documentary analysis rather than a literature review.
Particular research by criminologists who are notable contributors in the field of policing, private security, and sector training and education was referred to. These included Aleem et al. 2013; Borodzicz and Gibson (2006); Button (2007, 2011); Button and George (2001); Briggs and Edwards (2006); Brooks (2010); Brooks and Corkill (2014); George and Button (2000); Gill (2006, 2007, 2013); Gill et al. (2012, 2013); Lippert and Walby (2014); Manzo (2006); Nalla (2002); Johnston (1992); Nalla and Wakefield (2014); South (1985); Wakefield and Button (2014); Wakefield (2003, 2006, 2014)

From the professional/practitioner literature, research carried out by ASIS was very constructive as was their market research. Market surveys referred to included those of IFSEC and Optima Group (2014) and CoESS (2011). The Interim Security Professionals Taskforce (ISPT) (2008) discussion paper on identifying the key actions required to advance security professionals was of great assistance in understanding the alignment of areas of practice with qualification frameworks. The Security Institute of Ireland’s definitions of sectors and services within their national training manuals were beneficial towards understanding how the sector looks.

On the topic of career paths in general, the work of Adamson et al.(1998); Arthur et al. (1989); Barauch (2004); Carter et al. (2009); Cao and Thomas (2013); Hughes (1958); Inkson (2004); Schien (1996) and Johnson (2008) gave definition and focus and acted as a guiding framework throughout the study when drawing comparisons with the interviewee responses. Issues relating to aspects of a profession, professionalism and lifelong learning (LLL) became apparent as the research developed. Particular academic contributions referred to regarding the private security sector and it being or not being a profession; these included Adendorff (2009), Simonson (1996) and Wakefield and Button (2014). LLL researchers who helped conceptualize its many elements included Aspin and Chapman (2001), Beer (2007) and Colardyn (1999). Additionally, the European Commission and OECD were rich sources of information on LLL.

Semi-structured interviews were the chosen empirical method for this research in order to ascertain the views of key stakeholders as to the perceived foundations of a structured career path in the field of private security. Semi-structured interviews involve a series of open-ended questions based on the topic areas the researcher wants to cover, according to Hancock et al. (1998). They suggest that the open-ended nature of the question defines the topic under investigation and provides opportunities for both interviewer and interviewee
to discuss topics in more detail. Furthermore, they indicate that if the interviewee has difficulty in answering a question or provides only a brief response, the interviewer can use cues or prompts to encourage the interviewee to consider the question further. The interviewer also has the freedom to probe the interviewee to elaborate on the original response or to follow a line of inquiry introduced by the interviewee.

A strategy of purposive and snowball sampling was employed. Participant selection by purposive sampling was based on their sector knowledge and experience. Snowball sampling participants were recommended by the purposive sample; these were participants of whom initially the researcher was unaware, or had no access to, and through the purposive sample was able to develop a wider sector sample. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 22 participants internationally. Participation was confidential and anonymous, although several participants explicitly requested to be identified and presented as being representative of the sector. As the researcher’s home country is Ireland, the greatest number of interviewees came from there - eight in total. The others comprised three from the United Kingdom, three from America, two from South Africa, one from Canada, one from Australia, one from New Zealand, one from Germany, one from Spain and one from Italy. Notably, some of the interviewees had experience of working in a number of different countries and so were able to speak from an international perspective.

Interviewees provided a rounded, balanced approach to the study with representatives drawn from a range of sectors: private security, public policing, corporate security, general management, educational/academic and sector trade bodies. Notably, most have amassed experience of a combination of these sectors and were thus in a position to provide rich data. Many were, or, continue to be either employed in a full-time or voluntary capacity and are heavily involved in trade representative bodies, trade unions and security educational sector development roles with some having practitioner research experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-01</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Consultant &amp; Professional Association Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-02</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-03</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Consultant &amp; Professional Association Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-04</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-05</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Corporate Security Manager &amp; Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-06</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Commercial Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-07</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Commercial Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-08</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Commercial Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-09</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Corporate Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Consultant &amp; Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Corporate Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head of Education for Professional Association Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Corporate Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Corporate Security Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-17</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Consultant &amp; Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-18</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Security Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Head of Education for Professional Association Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Security Consultant &amp; Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-21</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Trade Union Organizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-22</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Security Practitioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Interviewee Sample

The first interview was used as a pilot and the interviewee was made aware of and agreed to this. Relevant changes and approach were applied to subsequent interviews following the initial one. This particular interview was conducted in Ireland with a security consultant with considerable expertise in the area of private security and training and education, and was part of the purposive sample already known to the researcher. This provided the opportunity of a safe environment to ask the questions and request constructive feedback from a trusted source.

Subsequently, interviews were conducted with three further Irish security sector representatives with considerable experience and expertise relevant to the topic under investigation. Thereafter, some interviews were conducted outside of Ireland and some again later in the country. Face to face interviews were conducted, as were telephone and Skype interviews. The latter approach was considered due to time, work and resources and
travel constraints of the researcher. It is expressed by Gilbert (2008) that face to face interviews are preferable as it allows a more traditional method where non-verbal cues in particular are able to be read by the interviewee. However, Holt (2010) notes that the use of telecommunications should be seriously considered as a preferred alternative to face to face interviews as they are a more practical option for more geographically-dispersed participants. King and Wincup (2007) indicate that telephone interviews may not be as effective due to distractions such as telephones ringing, children in the background and callers to the interviewees’ offices. However, the researcher took the same approach to the telephone interview as he would have if it was a face to face interview, ensuring no distractions were present at the researcher’s base; through the use of Skype some interviewees were visible and non-verbal cues were observable. Where the participants were located it was not possible for the researcher to ensure no distractions were present; this would have to be seen as a weakness of this option. However, the interviewer is not aware of any distractions suffered by the interviewees of this study during the interviews.

From the beginning of the process the researcher complied with the British Society of Criminology ethical guidelines and the University of Portsmouth ethical guidelines as reflected in the Ethics Self-assessment Form at Appendix 1. Ethical approval was granted by the University ethics committee as can be seen at Appendix 3. The only main concern was Data Protection which was fully adhered to, before, during and after the research through the data management procedures that were employed. Prior to commencing interviews, signed consent documentation was received in advance, which was supplied via e-mail to telephone and Skype interviewees and delivered in person in advance of face to face interviews. All participant information sheets were provided in advance. Notably, some interviewees refused to be audio taped. Reasons given included feeling uncomfortable with being taped and data protection concerns, despite the research topic being considered a relatively uncontroversial one. There were no major ethical issues with this study when requiring initial approval.

Once the data was collected it needed analyzing. Data analysis is a key component of grounded theory (Glazer and Strauss, 1967a), and Gilbert (2008) observes that coding and constant comparison of the data is one of the best known and influential features of the grounded theory approach. He points out that coding refers to the ongoing process of assigning conceptual labels to different segments of data to identify themes, patterns, processes and relationships. As Bitsch (2005) explains, after noting an event it is compared
to other events with respect to commonalities and differences with constant comparison serving to uncover and explain patterns and variations. This approach to the analysis allows researchers systematically to follow a series of steps in order to identify the themes needed to answer the research question (Gibbs, 2008; Charmaz, 2014). In their classic grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss (1967) advocate four stages of analysis: (1) codes, the purpose of which is to identify anchors that allow the key points of the data to be gathered; (2) concepts, in order to collect codes of similar content that allows data to be grouped; (3) categories, to group similar concepts that are used to generate a theory; (4) theory, to propose a set of explanations that explain the subject of the research.

Instead, this research adopted Strauss and Corbin's (1990) model, adapted from the original Glaser and Strauss (1967b) one, which develops a theoretical model through (1) open coding, (2) axial coding, and (3) selective coding before creation of the theoretical model. As previously highlighted, some participants agreed to be audio recorded and some did not, their right to privacy was therefore respected and they agreed to proceed with the interviews without recording. This required the researcher to be particularly attentive and check for understanding throughout these interviews to ensure accuracy since going back on audio recording was not possible later. All data gathered was coded and did not identify participants, and all data was kept secure.

Once the data was gathered it was transcribed in Microsoft Word and each interviewee was assigned a unique number, for instance, I-01. This began the open coding stage. To conduct this the researcher created an interview transcript log and began a line-by-line analysis, comprehensively reading through the data and creating tentative labels for chunks of data that summarized what was happening based on the meaning that emerged from the data.

The next stage - axial coding - identified relationships among the open codes. This was achieved by firstly establishing connections between concepts generated in the open coding stage that shared common properties or characteristics, then allowing the creation of the initial categories that are the concepts that stand for phenomena. The process of open and axial coding is illustrated in Table 2.3:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Transcript Excerpt</th>
<th>Open Coding</th>
<th>Axial Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider are barriers for progression within the sector?</td>
<td>I-01</td>
<td>The myopic security management does not allow progression into senior manager roles as these jobs are for their own and hire from their own</td>
<td>Roles held by retired ex-protective force and domino effect</td>
<td>Old Boys’ Network of ex-protective force has created a glass ceiling through domino hiring effect and do not or refuse to recognize non-protective force personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-02</td>
<td>All the top ranking jobs are kept for the high ranking policemen and army ones</td>
<td>Domino effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-03</td>
<td>The retired policeman keeps just hiring their own in subordinate positions and others don’t get a look in so you only get a job if you have a background in the police</td>
<td>Domino hiring effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3 Open and Axial Coding Example

All coding stages were underpinned by memos. These can be post-it notes, notes kept in a diary or electronic records, according to Gibbs (2008). The researcher kept a research diary and a word document containing memos. Memos are an essential element of the grounded theory methodology (Rich, 2012) and are essentially ‘notes to self’ that record ideas and connections as they occur in an analytic process such as the following example from this study:

I-04 shares the same view I-01, I-02, I-03, that there is a requirement for security managers to be trained to university level in SRM.

In the next stage - selective coding - the researcher worked through the data to locate the core variable that includes all the data. This was achieved by re-reading the transcripts and selectively coding any points relating to the identified core variable. In this stage the relationship connections between categories are visible and allow the creation of the main categories of the theoretical model.
The sample of 22 was deemed more than sufficient for this study as data saturation occurred at this point. In grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss (1967a) indicate that saturation of categories occurs when no new information is found in the data provided by the interviewees. In terms of reaching saturation point, the purpose was to seek saturation across the sample as a whole and not in relation to the individual countries represented in the study. The issues raised in the interviews could be said to be transferable across the security sector internationally, if not wholly generalizable due to the limitations of a qualitative research method.

Strauss and Corbin (1998) reminds us that at this point the grounded theory methodology does not give rise to findings but, instead, provides a tentative explanation of the studied phenomenon via the creation of a theoretical model. Rich (2012) indicates that researchers answer the question through analyzing the processes that make up key events in a conceptualized experience which results in substantive theory. The idea that the substantive theory developed is final is, however, naive according to Strauss and Corbin (1990). It is argued that the theory should be able to be applied generally, but is always provisional (Patton, 2002). As Rich (2012) argues, we must remember that they are just an abstraction of reality. He provides the analogy of copies made from a photocopy machine: these never provide a perfect reproduction, each producing the same image which may be missing some elements, and yet the unmistakable picture of what is happening is apparent in all copies.

**The Research Experience**

Lippert et al. (2015) assert that doing security research is difficult and that sample access can be problematic. They indicate that security services are secretive and hard to access due to their enclosed nature, what they refer to as behind the thin blue line. What they inform is that security personnel are not just reluctant respondents but also trained to evade questioning or to avoid full disclosure when participating in research, and that researchers are seen by security agencies as real outsiders who conduct critical, academic research. Lippert et al. (2015) argue that they are well equipped to be so, taking this to extremes because they use security as a rationale for what they do and thus as a means of avoiding scrutiny whenever deemed useful. Lippert et al. (2015) identify three kinds of pitfalls that researchers encounter in security research projects as: spins, security stalls and security shutdowns, as seen in Table 2.4:
Table: 2.4 Security Research Spins, Stalls and Shutdowns, Lippert et al. (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Spins</th>
<th>Security Stalls</th>
<th>Security Shutdowns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An effort to redirect or reshape the meaning of particular claims, observations or practices of a security agency for the inquiring researcher</td>
<td>Not intended to slow down the access but instead to slow down the transfer of information in an effort to buy time to reshape or prepare the information – however, this information is eventually available anyhow under FOI requests</td>
<td>The reasons for using a stall is in the hope that the researcher will either scale down or abandon the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to security shutdowns, Lippert et al. (2015) note that it is not only management who cause it to shut down - frontline security officers with union support are also to blame. Security shutdowns mean a complete lockdown of information release and are permanent. They highlight the negative reputational impact that the researcher may potentially suffer due to them being blacklisted by others networked to the immediate agency.

This study, fortunately, did not suffer spins, stalls or shutdowns. However, the research did experience some negatives. The research negatives, when considering them at the end of the journey, can only be seen as positives that contributed to how the researcher learned and adjusted throughout the study for the betterment of self. The negatives that occurred can be better described as frustrations that were overcome by utilizing new and developed abilities as a result of the study.

Organizing interviews was probably the greatest frustration. A major hurdle that existed was finding suitable interview participants. This stemmed from the lack of a suitable audience within the sector who are knowledgeable of this area, most likely resulting from the low body of knowledge that underpins the security management occupation. The sector does have some, but far from a plethora of, practitioners. This was overcome by the researcher having a large professional network and identifying a purposive sample comprising key stakeholders with the required expertise who could also provide direction.
to other suitable participants who held similar expertise. A further frustration was that some of those who were identified as potential providers of rich data did not participate or respond to requests; this was disappointing.

Another element of frustration associated with the sample was engaging participants outside the sector with the necessary expertise. Some indicated that they were unable to participate as they were not familiar with the security sector and how it was made up, and thus argued that, in their view, they could not be of real value to the study. This highlights the challenges of conducting research on professional development within a sector that is poorly defined with no developed career pathways. Fortunately, some sector interviewees hold external sector experience as well as sector experience and this provided the required external view. This primary data was complemented by secondary material, since details of other occupations that have better defined career pathways and how these were achieved are well documented.

Organizing interviewees was time consuming, and having to take time off work was a frustration as some cancelled or reorganized at the last minute and some continued to be un-contactable. Frustration arose from the researcher in respect of their undertaking the research solely from annual leave entitlements - the study was not employer-supported; thus this time had to be rearranged and further leave taken, impacting the researcher’s personal time.

The literature review was the other main source of frustration. Literature is very sparse on the subject of private security career paths and therefore there is little to compare with the empirical data gathered from interviewees. Again, this is most likely a result of the scant body of knowledge of private security and the lack of recognition security management receives as a discipline in its own right. Fortunately, research does exist on some of the individual elements of a career path in security, such as training and education, and material on other occupational sectors was also drawn upon. While the body of literature is relatively small, it did support the identification of emerging themes in the data.

The other area of real frustration associated with the literature review was the lack of research on security managers. While there are advances being made in this area, for instance, the contributions to the book by Walby and Lippert (2014) Corporate Security in the 21st Century: Theory and Practice in International Perspective which provides a real
insight into contemporary security management, the literature does not fully reflect what is happening within the contract sector. This is particularly relevant around the training and educational needs of security managers. Furthermore, the contract sector security manager and the corporate in-house security manager are very different roles, and research is particularly sparse on contract security managers and how their roles are both different and the same.

There were no negative ethical issues and, as previously highlighted, ethical documentation was sent to all participants in advance of the study, their consent received expressively and a consent form returned prior to the interview. Interviewees were fully aware of what their involvement meant and how they could withdraw, and they were given the option to be anonymous. Most interviewees expressively agreed to be representative of the sector and those who did not were given full anonymity.

The researcher only speaks English, and semi-structured interviewees went constructively considering some participants did not speak English as their first language; however, the latter were very proficient in speaking and understanding the researcher’s first language.

The purpose of the study was explained to each participant at the outset and what was required of them, followed by the researcher asking open-ended questions and avoiding leading questions or questions potentially leading the participant in a particular direction; and there was no bias. Nevertheless, to keep the study focused the researcher did have probe questions to use if required, and researcher reflexivity was fundamental to allowing the natural and free answering of questions.

**Conclusion**

As a method of inquiry, grounded theory provides the researcher with intuitive appeal and fosters creativity, and gives a systematic approach to data analysis that provides for data depth and richness. It is an effective approach to building new theories and understanding new phenomena. It responds to the idiosyncratic nature of this study and lays the foundations for future research. Private security career paths have not yet been the subject of academic inquiry and there is no previous research to rely upon. Therefore, using grounded theory for this study allowed the adoption of an investigative research method with no preconceived hypothesis and used continual comparative analysis of the data as it developed, resulting in the theoretical framework that developed - grounded in the data.
The goal of grounded theory is to generate a theory that explains how an aspect of the social world works and to develop one that emerges from the very reality the theory is developed to explain. It allows the researcher to derive a general abstract theory process, action or interaction in consideration of the views of the participants of the study. The latter brought a considerable breadth of sector experience to the research. They provided a balanced mix of practitioner, research-practitioner, educational, strategic business, human resource development and academic view of what the foundations of a structured career path should be. The research did not suffer spins, stalls or shutdowns and the only real frustration was that not all the interviewees requested to participate did so. As a research methodology, grounded theory worked very well in supporting the aims of this study, complementing the researcher’s epistemology and its fluid nature, allowing the generation of a theoretical framework of a topic not previously researched.
Chapter 3 – Conceptualizing Career Paths and Private Security

Introduction
This chapter seeks to focus the study by firstly conceptualizing career paths and private security. Since these are the main concepts of the study it is important to understand what they mean. The chapter begins by discussing the term ‘career path’. This is followed by defining private security and the manned guarding sector and its services, before examining how the private security sector has grown, who works within it, how it is perceived, and how regulation has become a feature. The chapter concludes with a short discussion of the main findings.

What is a Career Path?
A career can be conceptualized as the unfolding sequence of a person’s work experience over time within an occupational context (Hughes, 1958; Arthur et al. 1989). Inkson (2004) informs us that this refers to the path element, a metaphor that describes a journey through one’s career, comprising of both time and direction.

Cao and Thomas (2013) observe that career paths can be conceived both as ‘ladder’ and ‘lattice’ to reflect both upward and sideways movement. Schein (1996) earlier suggested that career paths can be multi-directional in nature, a view shared by Inkson (2004), who indicates career paths now move upward, downward, forward, backward, and sideways. Schien (1996) argues that structured career paths are important so that one can determine where to go and how to get there. Johnson (2008) shares this view, asserting that knowing the career choices one has means being able to follow a path rather than wandering around blind.

The fundamental component of career paths is a sequential list of positions or roles, qualifications, critical development experiences and competences that are accrued, strengthened, or required, according to Carter et al. (2009). Cao and Thomas (2009) suggest that each role should identify the relevant competences and expected behaviours relevant to each role and the training, education and qualifications required. Additionally, they note that this training should incorporate competences in preparation for progression to the next stage of one’s career.
The Chartered Institute for Professional Development (CIPD) (2010) observes that the elements of a career path are important for one’s general wellbeing, and Bevan (2010) argues the positive business case for investing in professional development as a means toward staff wellbeing. To successfully map one’s way along this life journey Barauc (2004) asserts that organizational structures, cultures and processes are essential inputs for career systems and should be supported through management leadership.

**What is Private Security?**

A contemporary definition of private security was developed in 2009 by the ASIS Foundation, and is the one adopted for the purpose of this study. They define it as the ‘non-governmental, private sector practice of protecting people, property, and information, conducting investigations, and otherwise safeguarding organizations assets’. They also identified its core elements, which provide a useful outline of the career areas that private security employees work within. These provide career path ladder and lattice options for the private security employee through the services the sector provides, and outlined in Table 3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical security</th>
<th>Personnel security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information security</td>
<td>Information systems security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations</td>
<td>Loss prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Legal aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency and contingency planning</td>
<td>Fire protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises management</td>
<td>Disaster management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-terrorism</td>
<td>Competitive intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive protection</td>
<td>Workplace violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td>CPTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1: Core Elements of Private Security, ASIS (2009)*

Loss prevention remains central to the responsibilities of frontline security guards and junior and middle management. However, as reflected in Dalton’s (2003) typology of corporate security development, contemporary in-house corporate security management
has become more strategic and is less focused on loss prevention. At the top of the house, while loss prevention has become more of a narrow security model, the emphasis is now on a wider security risk management model focused on internal control, calculated risk-taking and organizational resilience (Briggs and Edwards, 2006; Talbot and Jakeman, 2011). Over the past two decades internal control systems have developed to include non-financial risks. As Power (2004) informs us, internal control measures have expanded to include both regulatory and compliance matters and operations more generally. Brooks and Corkill (2014) observe that corporations have several organizational risks that require management oversight. Wakefield (2014) divides these into four categories, illustrated in Table 3.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Risk</th>
<th>Financial Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment risks</td>
<td>Liquidity and refinancing risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Development risks</td>
<td>Interest rate risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market risks</td>
<td>Currency risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance risks</td>
<td>Credit risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology risks</td>
<td>Counterparty risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operational Risk**

| Human resources risks           | Occupational health and safety risks |
| Information security risks      | Physical security risks              |
| Production, process & productivity risks | Personnel security risks           |
| Profitability risks             | Environmental risks                  |
| Project activity risks          | Man-made disasters                   |
| Contract and liability risks    | Property risks                       |
| Commodity and energy prices risks | Product safety risks                |
| Labour market risks             | Business interruption risks          |

*Table 3.2 Four Categories of Organizational Risk, Wakefield, (2014)*
From a career path perspective, internal control systems of organizational risk have helped shape the summit career path option both for new entrants and for those already employed. The corporate security manager or as also referred to as the CSO is therefore the hierarchy role that the climber can ascend towards, the peak of Barauch’s (2004) career path mountain. CSO’s are typically responsible for setting the security strategy and ensuring the organization is prepared and able to respond and recover, and that strategy embeds security through the organization. Briggs and Edwards (2006) champion the enterprise risk management model that requires security managers to possess business management skills rather than traditional security knowhow learned in protective state policing or military roles. Gill et al. (2007) take account of contemporary security management by contrasting the traditional security manager and the modern business one, seen in Figure 3.1:

Security ‘traditionalists’ versus ‘modern entrepreneurs’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditionalists</th>
<th>Modern entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security is:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Security is:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A discrete service function</td>
<td>Part of the business process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A necessary cost on bottom line</td>
<td>Integral to all activities and embedded in culture and process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with police and military expertise</td>
<td>Managed strategically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered through command and control</td>
<td>Measured in terms of return on investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured using traditional indicators such as arrest rates</td>
<td>More reliant on business acumen than security knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3.1: Security traditionalists versus modern entrepreneurs, Gill et al. (2007)*

Wakefield and Button (2014) assert that this model captures the realities of modern day security risk management. They recommend that it should be aligned within the corporate objectives that it serves and act as a business enabler. They build on the argument of Briggs and Edwards (2006) that current day security managers need contemporary
enterprise risk management skills often lacking in ex-protective force personnel. They do, however indicate that at junior and middle security management levels, skills gained by ex-protective roles such as protective security, investigations and intelligence do remain central to a loss prevention activity, therefore suggesting this is where traditionalist security managers may operate into the future.

Briggs and Edwards (2006) point out that there is a growing recognition of the strategic importance of security and as a result security departments need to operate at a much more senior level. Internal control systems have seen an increased need for CSO’s, thus providing progression opportunity for skilled managers and widening private security as a career option for suitably qualified candidates.

Corporate security either employs their security team directly or outsources it. Those employed directly are referred to as the in-house security team. These generally are comprised of manned security guards and team leaders, and a three tier security management structure provides a hierarchy career progression path (Brooks and Corkill, 2014). Further to management progression opportunity there are non-manager functionalist roles available in areas such as investigation, data analysis, cyber security and training and fraud prevention (Brooks, 2010; Lippert and Walby, 2014; Briggs and Edwards, 2006). Corporate security are less prominent in hiring their own security guards; instead they buy them in, contracting them from commercial private security providers; as a result, the majority of security guard career options are to be found in the contract sector of private security.

How has the Private Security Sector Grown?

Lippert et al. (2015) indicate that corporate security and security services generally remain understudied despite their long histories. There is a growing body of knowledge developing on corporate security management, although it remains in its infancy and under-researched; therefore, it is difficult to identify how many people are working as corporate security managers (Talbot and Jakeman, 2011; Brooks and Corkill, 2014).

The contract security sector is much more researched; as a service sector private security has seen a significant growth over the last century and accelerated particularly since the 1960s. Nalla and Wakefield (2014) inform us that post Second World War private security has significantly grown in response to social, political and economic factors. Today there is
an omnipresence of security guards with whom society comes into contact on a daily basis. Most of these are employed in the contract sector, brought in by corporate security departments from commercial private security providers who supply human resource security guarding solutions. Corporate security management employs contract junior and middle security managers or, alternatively, the contracted guards are managed by the corporate security management team - what White (2010) refers to as a hybrid security management model.

More and more we are being informed that the numbers of police are diminishing and private security is taking over. As Button (2007a) observes, society is more likely to come into contact with a private security guard than a police officer due to the fact that the former now outnumber police officers throughout the world (van Steden and de Waard, 2013). Referring to the British sector, White (2016) informs us that their government spend is around £4 billion annually for goods and services from private companies providing security services. He indicates that there is one security employee to every 170 citizens compared to one police officer to 382 citizens. The reasons for private security growth are many, including the expansion of mass private property, rising crime levels, the fear of crime, terrorism, the political nature of policing, austerity and outsourcing, and governance and corporate social responsibility.

Privatization of police functions is likely to continue (Prenzler, 2013) as governments are no longer able to cope with the cost of policing crime and the demands of society to keep them safe in an ever-changing world. A study carried out by Accenture in 2012 of 17 police services, including Australia; Canada; Denmark; England and Wales; Finland; Germany; India; Ireland; Italy; Norway; Portugal; Scotland; Slovakia; Spain; and the United States identified partnership with the private security sector as a ‘one step’ towards meeting the needs of future policing. The result is likely to create further private policing career path options for the private security sector both at frontline guarding level and in security risk management consulting, investigation and training.

A further reason for the growth of security within corporations is due to several corporate scandals (Lippert et al. 2013). The Lehman Brothers collapse and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill affected the safety of their employees, the world economy and its environment. Such scandals have questioned how corporations govern themselves and meet their corporate social responsibility (Osofsky, 2013). The result of this is that organizations have
to internally control their activities and be able to demonstrate compliance (Tricker, 2012). Sarre and Prenzler (2011) indicate that corporations are more likely to look to self-protection and aim to avoid poor security that increases an organization’s legal liability and exposes it to other vulnerabilities. Page and Spira (2004) indicate that all aspects of the business are focused on compliance with security, health and safety, environmental and information issues as critical risks. Developments in corporate governance and compliance requirements and the risks faced for failure in respect of the latter have created a corporate security risk management role (Brooks and Corkill, 2014). Lippert et al. (2013) point out that corporate security is a control function providing a means to regulate, investigate and prosecute in the context of the organization.

A further growth element is globalization. Through the internet a risk-interconnected world, of products and devices has developed that has allowed trade to transcend borders. Held et al. (2000) describe the process of globalization as the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnections in all aspects of contemporary social life including security. The negative impact on organizations is the threat posed from organized crime and terrorism, particularly the cyber threat that advancing technology presents. Aleem et al. (2013) assert that the reliance on technology presents one of the weakest links in contemporary organizational security as certain threats can fall into the functional gaps between physical and information technology security departments - what they describe as ‘converged threats’. They inform us that this converged threat has created a need for integrated security managers, thus providing progression opportunities and creating attractive career path roles.

The growth of private security has created arguably the largest global service sector workforce, and it is predicted this will continue to grow (ASIS, 2013). Such growth has created a number of roles, particularly at frontline security guarding and, more recently, the emergence of corporate security risk managers and consultants. Positively, private security can be seen to provide a career option and is a trade that does not tend to suffer from recessionary times; while crime rises when economies experience a downturn, in a recovering economy history has shown us that with that prosperity crime re-appears. This suggests there will always be a need for security and its human resources.
How Many are Employed in the Sector?

The global private security sector is enormous; however, understanding how many people work within it is difficult due to the lack of research of the sector. Manzo (2006) informs us that most studies of private security have concentrated on manned guards within contract manned guarding, therefore, statistics of how many are employed do exist (Walby and Lippert, 2014). Nalla and Wakefield (2014) provide estimates of how many security officers are employed in some regions; this information is summarized in Table 3.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>7 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Regional Estimate of Number of Working Security Guards

What they point out is that there are discrepancies in establishing the precise number of security personnel that are employed and engaged in security activities, those who are actually working as opposed to having a license to work. Private security regulation has resulted in the generation of statistics of those who have licenses; however, they do not differentiate between someone who has a license to work and another who is working. One such example can be seen in Ireland; the national private security regulator, The Private Security Authority, keeps a public database of security personnel who hold licenses to work. They detail over twenty thousand security officers having such a license, although, it is not indicated how many of these are actually working. Therefore, reliance on such databases can only be taken as estimates.
When describing the actual size of the manned guarding sector, van Steden and Sarre (2007) indicate that data must be treated with caution. Notably, it is not uncommon to read about public police versus private police ratios to illustrate the size of the sector. Stenning (1994) cautions the use of this ratio data, that when we do this we may indeed be overestimating its size. Regularly reported are ratios such as 2:1 for instance, although what Stenning explains is that public policing ranges far wider than solely police officers, therefore many of the ratio estimates may be misleading. Nevertheless, regardless of ratios, private security has grown to employ up to twenty five million manned guards globally according to Nalla and Wakefield (2014). Van Steden and Sarre (2007) note that in contrast to Shearing et al.’s. (1980) quiet revolution prior to the explosion of private security services, private security has become a noisy 21st century juggernaut providing vital policing partners in maintaining social order.

**What are the Backgrounds of those Employed within the Sector?**

As previously highlighted, research on security managers is sparse. The little that does exist indicates they come predominately from police and military backgrounds (Button, 2011). Much of the empirical research relied upon dates back to the 1990s and refers to Hearnden’s British study. Today’s private security researchers contend that this ex-protective force cohort do continue to be employed in security management positions. Manunta (1996) does make reference to the security manager that does not hail from the police or military. He likens security managers to chess pieces, outlined in the table 3.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chess Piece</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td>The Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rook</td>
<td>The Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>Mainstream Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.4 Manuta’s Security Manager Background Categorization*

There is growing evidence that the Bishop is becoming the dominant force and that they are increasingly taking up corporate security risk management roles (Brooks and Corkill, 2014). Briggs and Edwards (2006) contend that this is a result of the competence required for a contemporary security risk management role not held by those from police and military backgrounds. This is due to the evolving nature of security risk management.
anchored in corporate governance and accountability (Lippert et al. 2014) that requires a different set of skills than those the traditional security manager would have gained in policing and military roles.

Notably, though, the contract sector seems to have been left behind and somewhat alienated from this career development of corporate security managers, and corporate security management seems to be alienated from the mainstream security sector. Brooks and Corkill (2014) argue that while the corporate security manager does carry out a security function they do not belong to the security sector and are perceived as being highly qualified and specialised compared to those in the mainstream contract sector.

There is a plethora of research on security guards dating back to the RAND Report of the 1970s and the subsequent Hallcrest Reports of the 1980s in America. These include: South’s 1985 British observation research; Manzo’s 2006 Canadian study; Wakefield’s 1999 British study; Rigakos’s 2002 Canadian study; Button’s 2003 British retail security officer study; Perkins’ (2009) door supervisor study; the more recent British Security Sector in Perceptive study by Gill et al.(2013) and the CoESS (2011) European Facts and Figures market study. The background of security guards in these studies differed, as did the reasons they took up employment in the role, as summarized in the Table 3.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Guard Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in college, using the night shift to study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in college looking for a role with limited entry criteria to pay their tuition fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpackers looking to earn money for travelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low skilled people with little or no other employment options and little future prospects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees from protective force occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirees from other occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant employees doing security guarding until something else comes along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those using private security to act as experience for application to the police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: Security Guard Background Summary

As a result of the differing backgrounds and reasons for employment, Nalla and Wakefield (2014) argue there is no typical security officer. Additionally, the contract sector is not
seen to be a steady employer. It provides little job security and is seen by many as a means to an end as opposed to creating a meaningful career option. Instead, the sector historically suffers from poor pay and conditions (Wakefield, 2006) and due to the lack of training and educational requirements, it has created a sector with limited entry criteria (Manzo, 2006), thus leading to one demonstrating transient high turnover (Button, 2007).

There is no average age. This is dependent on region; for instance, in the original RAND and Hallcrest reports, security guards were described as ageing white males. Button’s (2003) study identified them as being much younger and eager while CoESS (2011) indicates the average age is 35 years. One trend that is common regardless of region is that the contract sector is particularly male dominated; this, Button (2011) indicates, is a result of the dominance of ex-protective force personnel who hire their own on retirement from the police and military occupations that by extension are also heavily male oriented. While the contract sector provides for one of the largest workforces across the world, it does not cater well for diversity. The career path message sent by the sector is that security is only suitable for retired police and military.

**How is the Manned Guarding Sector Perceived?**

Identity is one element of a meaningful career - it provides one with a sense of pride and is important to a person’s self-esteem. Association with private security drums up certain connotations of the sector and of those who work within it. For those not familiar with the modern private security sector they may see it as the watchman stereotype that Livingstone and Hart (2010) identify. For them, the earliest and most enduring image of private security is the watchman, centering on a gross incompetence theme. Perception, either positive of negative, has the power to attract or not attract new entrants and retain or not retain those already employed. Those in CSO roles appear to be the elite and have earned a certain elite’s status. This is particularly relevant where business managers are managing a security programme and they are seen as being highly qualified and professional; conversely the contract sector does not seem to have managed to do this and it is not perceived as a viable career option. Manzo (2006) indicates that American popular culture is full of negative portrayals of private security staff, resulting in the sector struggling to attract new entrants and retain the good ones. Button’s (2003) British study of shopping centre security guards demonstrates they suffer repeated ridicule, indeed leading him in 2007 to write a chapter, *I’m a security guard get me out of here*, to express their feeling towards their job.
Arguably, the sector has managed to fulfill society’s negative perception of it. Poor standards of training and education, criminal activity and high profile failures to meet its contractual service obligations has done it little favours in attracting people to it as a viable career. The London Olympics of 2012 is a real example of how the world largest private security provider failed to deliver. It was shrouded with reports of poor training, hiring and vetting practices. White (2016) reports that a G4S whistleblower responsible for vetting was not herself vetted and shortcuts were taken in vetting procedures. He further reports of ghost sniffer dog patrols. The purpose of these patrols was to stop someone smuggling a bomb inside or discover one. Considering that the London Olympics was elevated to a critical infrastructure one, such practices arguably introduced risk, ironically by those paid to reduce risk. This reinforces poor perception of the sector and leads to a loss of public confidence in it, steers people away from joining it and not viewing it as a career they can either be proud to work in or to develop through.

The gross incompetence watchman theme is reinforced by the sector not embracing training and education. In the Rebirth of Private Security (2005) Les Johnston referred to the poor professional practices and standards and low levels of training within private security as a reason for the negative perception held of the sector. Two Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) studies, from 2009 and 2013, of the current state of affairs within the private security sector found that inadequate training was one of the greatest risks to security strategy. The studies cite a lack of training and education as the top reasons why contingency and response plans are not effective. For someone considering a career in the sector the lack of training and education may lead them to think it is an unprofessional one and to look to other sectors for employment.

The contract sector has a long association with criminality, particularly door supervisors employed in the night-time economy at pubs and clubs. It is this hired gun member of private security involved in criminal activity that Livingstone and Hart (2010) inform us is the corner-stone of the gravest fear of society of the private security sector’s role in policing. Furthermore, such a perception is likely to discourage applications for work within the mainstream sector. In Bouncers: Violence and Governance in the Night-time Economy, Hobbes at al. (2003) report poor standards of training and violence amongst this cohort. A career in the sector is not an attractive one as it is deemed unsafe. In Violence in the Night-time Economy, Finney (2004) highlights employees work in a substance-fueled
world of machismo and ego, thus their work environment does not typically provide a safe place of work and the job is seen as a hazardous one with little protection. This is evident in Perkins’ (2009) study of British door supervisors, highlighting the magnitude of risk faced by this security career family that operates in a completely different occupational culture to mainstream security guards. Door supervisors in particular are the members of the manned guarding sector that the public are more likely to encounter in their leisure time, thus who may witness their unprofessional practices. However, Livingstone and Hart (2010) remind us that the wider private security sector such as security guarding in retail and manufacturing has also witnessed incidents involving criminality and general unprofessionalism akin to that in the night-time economy.

Security guarding is stereotyped, does not attract people, and is a stigmatized role. In their ethnographic study of British and Swedish security guards Lofstrand et al. (2015) depict them as doing “dirty work”. This dirty work is understood in three senses: Physically: they sometimes have to be hands-on, touching people, objects and bodily fluids. Socially: they are required to manage stigmatized people and need to behave in a servile manner to both employers and customers. Morally: as a result of holding a stigmatized job and viewed by society as tainted and disreputable. Notably, they report one of the key elements of a servile relationship between the employer and them is being “treated as dirt and put in one’s place” (Lofstrand et al. 2015:12). They highlight that security guards feel stigmatized by their tainted occupation, suffer low self-esteem and are perceived by others as being expendable and of low value. While such negative perception of them helps shape their attitudes, fears and beliefs, it also shapes the minds of those outside who may deem the role of security as one that is unattractive.

A negative perception of the sector is problematic for career path development and it seems that what we know of the sector is drawn from a body of knowledge that is arguably no longer relevant to today. For instance, Stenning (1994) argues that researchers need to stop referring to Kakalik and Wildhorn’s (1971) study of the American private security sector which portrayed it negatively, indicating the sector has moved on significantly since and that there are also positive aspects to it and rewarding careers. Stenning (1994) argues that a negative aspect of the Rand Corporation study is that the perceptions that it presented in 1971 remain the public view of private security today, particularly the stereotyped low skilled ageing white male security guard. However, it does seem that some of the sector has not moved on - Wakefield's (1999) ethnographic study of the British
private security sector suggested over two decades later that this stereotype holds true, and more recently Gill et al. (2013) report that the contract sector remains resistant to training and education.

**How is Private Security Regulated?**

Regulation is often seen as one element to professionalizing an occupation and increasing standards through training and education. Referring to Ireland and the UK there is evidence of the sector making attempts to increase standards through self-regulation recognizing the efforts made by the Irish Security Industry Association (ISIA) and the British Security Industry Association (BSIA). However, as Shearing and Stenning (1983) observe, self-regulation was unsuccessful due to the lack of voluntary commitment of security providers and insufficient enforcement capabilities comparative to the standards that trade bodies promoted. Eventually, as a result of the sector being unable to increase standards itself, state intervention was required in the form of regulation. White (2010) informs us that regulation occurred as the result of a long running political agenda of the private security sector lobbying government since the 1960s. This eventually led to regulation of the manned guarding sector of private security in 2001 in the UK. In Ireland, the private security sector was regulated in 2004 due to government concerns of criminal involvement as highlighted in Irish parliamentary discussions in 1999.

Regulation brought about what is referred to as licensing. The purpose of licensing is to protect the public interest (Button, 2007a) and is achieved through licensing frontline security personnel carrying out security duties. Security providers in some regions such as Ireland who sell a security service also require a license. The interests of the private security sector are controlled by the state, and licenses are issued by the regulator who can revoke them for breaches of private security legislation. Button and George (2006); Button (2014); Prenzler (2013); Minnaar (2007) and CoESS (2011) observe differing regulatory regimes in America and Canada, Australia, South Africa and Europe. The most common are competency-based licensing. Gill et al. (2013) indicate that training requirements typically form a major part of the requirements of a regulatory system. Button and George (2006) and Kezeli (2015) indicate that in America there are some states that do not require mandatory training; instead, they are required to just pay a license fee to operate, and there is indeed no requirement for a security guard or manager to be qualified in some states.
The CoESS (2011) *Facts and Figures* report provides a comprehensive overview of the mandatory training requirements for security guards in Europe. Notable from their report is the variance between countries. As already highlighted, some countries require a security guard to undergo as much as 430 hours’ mandatory training while others require as little as 28. Furthermore, there is little evidence of refresher or up-skilling training in most countries, the exception being Spain. Another notable trend in their report is the lack of mandatory training for security managers with only 50% of countries requiring mandatory training of security managers. This is what Button (2011) observes as one of the major flaws in regulation - not extending licensing to security managers. He refers to this as the management gap in regulation. This means that there are security managers working in the sector without proven minimum competence and criminal background screening.

While regulation has introduced standards and removed some of the criminality within the sector, it has in the main been unsuccessful and has not managed to meet its aims (Wakefield and Button, 2014). This is a view shared by the sector as evident in Gill *et al*’s. (2013) study. They indicate the regulator does not have enough teeth and is not proactive enough in pursuing those who fail to comply with legislation, and that contractors are providing little if any training. There is no ongoing training for security guards and employers are not developing and harnessing talented security guards or junior managers. There is also a view that training has become another way of making money out of the operatives and the sector and is being run by providers who do not care about quality. Another aspect reported is the lack of a clear progression path. Arguably, regulation has created an entry level point of a career path; however, it has not provided anywhere to progress to according to Wakefield and Button (2014).

**Discussion**

As Lofstrand *et al*. (2015) observe, it is now a cliché to say that policing and how security is provided have undergone significant transformation with policing becoming more and more pluralized. As job functions security and the private security sector have become beneficiaries of austerity, cost cutting and outsourcing, corporate scandals, old, new and cyber terrorism and crime and the fear of crime in an ever-changing globalized world impacted by strategic, financial, operational and hazard risks (Wakefield, 2014). These and emerging risks, both the known and the known unknowns, create uncertainty that has seen a growth spurt in the numbers of corporate security managers with responsibility for contemporary security risk management. Positively, this has created a career path
opportunity to the top of the corporate security management ladder. It is also one that new entrants and existing employees can aspire to.

These entrepreneur security managers’ competences are anchored in general and business management backgrounds and take responsibility for the wider risk management framework. They rely on training and education as a means of doing the job and advancing their career with security risk management first and postgraduate qualifications and professional certifications becoming the expectation of employers. This cohort’s practice is underpinned by a body of knowledge that has seen them become an elite security manager group who, some argue, are no longer part of the wider security sector. Previously, these roles were filled by retired military and police, however, the ever-changing business world and emerging risks have meant they are less sought after. It is believed they no longer fit the needs of organizations as their skill-set is narrow and anchored in public policing roles that do not transfer well to corporate security management or the private sector. Many of these contemporary CSO’s are also seeing their own role responsibilities expanding to include the cyber security management function which itself is seeing the move towards integrated security managers.

The corporate security manager role provides a three-tier hierarchy security management structure at strategic, operational and frontline level, essentially providing a structured hierarchy career path. Additionally, there are options to move to other business management roles, and there are specializing roles available, thus providing real career path opportunities.

CSO’s generally do not directly hire the frontline security guarding team. Instead, they have become the buyers of one of the largest workforces in the world. The sellers, the manned guarding sector of the private security sector, provide them with a human resource prevention measure. The demand for organizations to guard against risk and ensure compliance means a demand for these frontline security personnel. The police are no longer able to keep up with the demands of society for security that has resulted in manned security guards outnumbering the police (van Steden and de Waard, 2013). Private security has capitalized by filling the gap, creating an entry level career path option, while at the same time making a profit on society’s vulnerability.
The growth of private security has seen it become arguably the largest services sector employer globally, and it is forecast to continue growing (ASIS, 2013). The introduction of regulation is regarded as contributing toward the creation of an entry level standard; however, it has not provided a career progression model, a limitation of the sector that is consistent across jurisdictions. No roadmap exists for frontline security personnel to navigate from entry level contract security guarding to the top of the ladder corporate security manager position. Moreover, there is a missing progression path in between for those already employed.

Considering the growth of the sector and its predicted continuation, career path opportunities will continue to evolve and should be seen as a genuine career option although it is not, particularly at frontline security guarding level; instead, it has replaced building and catering as one of the great employers of unskilled staff (Borodzicz and Gibson, 2006). Corporate security has realized it needs a different form of manager and it has managed to create career pathways and progression opportunities. Arguably, the CSO and risk management as an occupation are becoming mini professions and pulling away from the wider security sector. The contract sector has not managed to achieve such success; it struggles to harness its employees and is unable to attract the best candidates. The sector continues to hire traditional security managers from the police and military instead of harnessing their own and providing them with the tools for meaningful progression. Training and education does not feature prominently, and it seems regulation has achieved little in raising the perceptions of private security, indeed nor has the sector itself (Button and George, 2006). Private security personnel play a significant and substantial role in securing our society; however, there seems to remain an unprofessional aspect associated with it, not helped by major, highly publicized service delivery fiascos. Contributing to this is the sector’s perceived association with the criminal underworld, employing persons who many in society don’t perceive as fit and proper, providing their employees with poor pay and working conditions, displaying poor service quality standards, providing limited or no training and education, and offering weak human resource management and development practices. These dimensions play an important role in determining levels of professionalism among security operatives and improving the scope to attract quality candidates who may view security as a potential career.

Global security issues create fear amongst society and threaten their safety. The dimensions of security that benefit people within society are firstly that security is a
necessary condition for the effective liberty of citizens that includes the feeling both of freedom and freedom from harm, and secondly that it has an important social dimension. Considering then the fundamental need people have for security it is clear security is required for their wellbeing. With police numbers shrinking and their being less visible, and cognizant of the continued threat from crime, the fear of crime and the terrorist threat, austerity and corporate social responsibility, risk uncertainty and the known unknowns, the door remains open for private security to continue growing. This should create the career path opportunity that provides meaningful progression options for those looking to enter the sector and those within looking to progress. However, it clearly lacks the elements of a career pathway that provides defined movement.
Chapter 4 - Career Paths: Where are we now?

Introduction
This chapter presents the first of the three stages of the empirical research into security career paths, considering the question of what career paths currently look like. It draws on empirical data to inform what the current career path structure looks like within the manned guarding sector. The chapter begins by identifying how well developed career paths are seen to be. Subsequently, the chapter examines how well defined current roles and responsibilities are, discusses the typical security guard and manager backgrounds and considers attitudes to, and engagement in, training and education and its availability. Finally, it explores what are considered to be the main barriers for progression. The chapter then concludes with a discussion of the themes.

How Well-Developed are Career Paths in Manned Guarding?
Most interviewees reported that, with the exception of an entry level route arguably created through regulation, a structured career path in the contract sector does not exist. This is consistent with a 2014 British survey of 203 practitioners conducted jointly by IFSEC and Optima Group that reported 50.7% of respondents observing that no defined career path exists.

Already highlighted are the different regulatory regimes throughout the EU (Nalla and Wakefield, 2014) and most interviewees noted these have provided an entry route. However, as the regulatory regimes differ so do the progression opportunities; in the EU there is no defined standard for progression, as some interviewees noted. In South Africa and New Zealand there are progression opportunities to supervisor and junior management. These have been created through regulation according to interviewees from New Zealand and South Africa. However, the Irish, Canadian, Australian, Italian, German, Spanish, and British interviewees considered that regulators in their countries were less progressive and do not address progression from entry level security guarding roles.

American interviewees considered that regulation is not such a central feature of the manned guarding sector and does not shape career paths. In the US there is an array of regulatory regimes that differ from state to state, some requiring entry level training and some only a license fee (Button and George, 2006; Strom et al. 2010; da Silva, 2010).
The disparate nature of the sector (Brooks and Corkill, 2010) has an impact on career paths according to some interviewees. As van Steden and de Waard (2013) indicates, the sector is fragmented with a mix of small, medium and large security providers. The larger ones do provide progression opportunities but the smaller ones do not, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“The big ones like G4S do provide opportunities and progression due to their size but the smaller ones do not have the structure to create career paths. What you will find is some of these smaller ones are family run and your best chance of progression is to supervisor if you’re lucky.” (1-02)

Most interviewees suggested that large security providers are in the minority and the majority of them are small and medium sized. Within these the opportunities are less likely due to their size and profile. They typically do not create a culture of developing their staff due to their business capacity, as one of the British interviewees suggested:

“Unless they are winning big contracts, small companies are not career progressive.” (1-03)

Most interviewees reported that better progression opportunities exist in in-house corporate security units, and they suggested that these environments carry a higher status than the contractor route. Furthermore, most contract security managers aspire to work in an in-house corporate security department, as explained by one of the British interviewees:

“You will find that most junior and middle contractor managers want to aspire to be part of a corporate functionally.” (1-09)

Most interviewees suggested that in-house corporate security units can provide job security and progression routes due to their having multi-disciplinary and lateral movement of roles. In the contract sector, by contrast, the movement is typically narrow and vertical and not good for career advancement, as one of the British interviewees reported:

“The contractor route is short and narrow. If you stay too long in the contractor world you won’t step across into the corporate world.” (1-10)
Some interviewees suggested that there are more opportunities to move upwards and sideways within corporate security units. Brooks and Corkill (2014) outline three levels of security management within a corporate organization: front-line, middle-level and senior security executive. As they describe, the frontline security manager is responsible for providing security advice, assistance and the policy consistent with a broader corporate policy based on the needs of the organization. This manager is strategic and responsible for policy and implementation of security procedures. The middle-level security manager is responsible for the management of the security business unit, its resources and assets and for the provision of security advice to business unit managers. They are also responsible for provision of threat and risk analysis for the business unit. Their authority is delegated by the CSO. The senior security executive manager, the corporate security manager or CSO, is focused on governing the business to achieve strategic control through engagement with the external socio-cultural environment and therefore influences the whole organization. They no longer control only the security department, but rather several departments as seen in Table 4.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Security Executive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Organizational Departments who Directly Report to the Senior Security Executive Structure, Brooks and Corkill (2014)

Interviewees reported that there are other opportunities available in technical or specialised roles; however, they caution that one could end up too specialised and this could also affect their career movement, as one British interviewee explained:

“They can move to investigation roles, cyber security or areas like counter fraud and become specialised, although the danger is they become less likely to progress further if they become too specialised as they will end up with a narrow skill-set.” (1-11)
Most interviewees reported that entry level roles such as security guarding and door supervisor are well defined due to regulation, as one of the Irish interviewees illustrated:

“Before regulation there was a general view of what a security guard does, but one of the positive aspects of regulation is it put definition on them so we now know what they do and at what level their competences are.” (1-09)

The same interviewee indicates that this definition means the security guard is aligned to their capabilities as their competence level is now developed and mapped to their responsibilities, and they are not carrying out duties beyond their level of expertise. However, most interviewees reported that beyond security guarding it is less defined, therefore, there could be some working in security management roles and beyond their capability. Some interviewees reported that this is a feature of the contract sector with many working in management roles with solely security guarding experience, or with no qualification, and some start up manned guarding security provider companies with no business experience. One Irish interviewee indicated that:

“Yesterday they were security guards or doing sentry duty in the army and the next day they are running a security guarding company without any experience of running a business.” (1-04)

Security roles are better defined where regulatory regimes are more advanced as seen in South Africa and New Zealand. Interviewees from these regions reported that regulation has defined junior management roles. Minnaar (2007) identifies that the South African regulatory system provides stepping stone progression from security guarding to junior management positions.

The ISPT (2008) argue that when society thinks of private security they tend to perceive all security personnel including managers as security guards. This is problematic for the definition of security roles as such perception does not show the higher level roles that are available to aspire to. This is a problem that Brooks (2010) observes, referring to the definitional role dilemma within the sector that contributes to confusion of who security personnel are and what they do. This definitional dilemma, he suggests, is causing difficulty when developing progression routes and career paths due to a lack of clear definition of sector roles. The European private security trade body umbrella organization,
the Confederation of European Security Services (CoEES) (2008), indicates that security management roles progress from supervisor through to chief executive officer. Sector roles are esoteric; the view of most interviewees is that supervisory and site manager roles have a general definition that is understood by most but is not written down, and there is nothing to refer to when looking at what the universal supervisor or site manager does. While roles are generally better defined in these areas, the higher level ones are less clear, as illustrated by Irish and British interviewees:

“Roles such as security officer, supervisor, middle management and regional manager are generally well defined but it is the roles beyond this that are less defined.” (1-04)

“In the contract sector the operations manager is often no more than a contracts manager.” (1-10)

Carter et al. (2009) argue that competences should be aligned to relevant roles which dictate the level of ability one has to carry out their role successfully. Arguably, regulation of entry level security guarding roles has meant defined competences are aligned to their respective national qualification frameworks. A qualification framework is an instrument for the development, classification and recognition of skills and knowledge and competences along a continuum of agreed levels. It provides a method of structuring both existing and new qualifications defined by clear statements of what a learner must know and be able to do on the job (Tuck, 2007). Tuck (2007) asserts that this has a direct link to what the individual in the workplace is capable of achieving, and dictates their level of responsibility. Qualification frameworks provide a clear indicator of how one can progress from one level of competence to another. Internationally, security guards are aligned to entry level qualification frameworks assisted by regulation.

Most interviewees asserted that lack of role definition is problematic for progression opportunities. A similar view is expressed by ASIS (2103). Referring to the lack of security manager definition, one of the Irish interviewees explained the problem that this presents when aiming to provide a secure environment and deliver competent risk management services:
“The term ‘manager’ is often used to describe those who are no more than supervisory staff, suggesting that the term ‘manager’ in private security is used very loosely. This lack of definition may be presenting a problem with the service being delivered. Where a client buys a service and engages a security manager to manage it, they may have expectations that are not being fulfilled if managers are no more than supervisors and are not providing the management capabilities the client expects.” (1-01)

On the subject of career progression, one of the British interviewees highlighted the problem with not having defined roles from top to bottom:

“Security managers will progress so far but because of their lack of skills they won’t get into some of the top positions like CEO. The CEO comes from the financial sector and [they] are usually accountants but know nothing about security, but if the roles were defined and the core competences defined it might be possible to progress.” (1-10)

From a job title perspective, how roles transcribe to practice differs between contract and corporate security according to most interviewees, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“There is a difference between operations manager in an in-house security department and the contract sector. I see the operations manager in an in-house setting as one who manages and runs a business unit whereas in the contract sector the operations manager is no more than a client liaison manager and does not run a security business unit or manage real security issues.” (1-04)

A security manager in a corporate sector and in the contract sector has different functionality according to interviewees, as one of the British interviewees indicated:

“The contractor meets the strategy set out by the corporate security manager and they manage the personnel to meet their needs, aims, strategy and vision.” (1-09)

Another British interviewee suggested that contract security managers do not fulfill security roles anymore and considered that:
“Security managers in the contract sector are no longer working in security, they are running around filling in KPIs and they don’t do things like threat assessments and are more like client services managers.” (1-10)

This suggests that contract security managers’ skills are aligned much more to relationship and personnel management than security risk management.

**What are the Typical Backgrounds of Those Working Within the Sector?**

Interviewees were asked to identify the typical background of security guards and managers. Security personnel roles are typically categorized as security guards and security managers and are further distinguished as in-house and commercial or contract security (Wakefield, 2006; Button, 2007; Briggs and Edwards, 2006; McGee, 2010; Perkins, 2009; Hobbs et al. 2003). Guarding and managing are clearly very different roles. Looking at these in turn, the typical background of security guards is well documented (Kakalik and Wildhorn, 1971; Cunningham et al. 1985; Rigakos, 2002; Wakefield, 2006; Manzo, 2006; Button, 2007; Lofstrand et al. 2015). These studies depict security guards in a number of different ways and, as already highlighted, led Nalla & Wakefield (2014) to observe that internationally there is no typical security officer. Interviewees of this study supported this assertion. They highlighted that many join the sector as there is limited entry criteria, that this suits the low skilled and with high turnover levels there is always work available. However, as one of the Irish interviewees highlighted:

“They are not good for the industry as they get stuck in the system and have no drive to get on.” (1-03)

According to most interviewees the sector attracts migrants. The Canadian interviewee highlighted that highly qualified medical migrants coming from the African continents take up employment in the security sector while they are completing their exams or looking for other work. Irish and British interviewees indicated the same, and suggested that the security sector is one of the first jobs they look for. They indicated that during the economic boom time of the early to late noughties contract security providers could not attract ‘British and Irish national’ security staff as, in contrast, these took up employment in the construction sector. In response to this lack of resource availability security providers hired from a pool of Eastern Europeans, the African continents and students from
India and Pakistan. The recession has since changed the profile of security guard applicant according to two of the Irish interviewees:

“The recession has changed the profile of security guard applicant. It has always attracted the ones with no other options, but now that there is no work and they come in and are great for the industry. Some come from business backgrounds and there are teachers and pilots working in the sector but they won't stay and [they] are waiting for the upturn and [they] will be gone and we will be left again with the lower quality ones.” (1-08)

“We have become a bit of a resting ground for some very good candidates due to the downturn in the economy, but they are always looking to escape back to what they are qualified to do. You see it with those coming from construction but once the building trade gets going again they will be back there.” (1-05)

Students are attracted to the security sector according to some interviewees. They suggested that the night shifts are great for attracting students who can use the time to study and pay their way through college while working nights and weekend hours that do not interfere with their classroom attendance times. They also pointed to other non-student security officers who are low skilled and not motivated by their work and just want a quiet life and be able to sleep and pick up their wages without too much effort. A further cohort is those that struggle with the English language. One interviewee indicated that private security providers deploy them on night shifts as they would not put them in front of a client because of their communication skills. Nights and weekends also suit people out of necessity. One of the British interviewees indicated that there are some very good security guards working in the sector by necessity and not by choice because of family circumstances. They suggest that their partners can work by day and them by night - and no child-minding costs. However, they indicated that once the kids are old enough they will leave, and some educate themselves during these years to get out of the sector. Taking up part-time security work as a door supervisor at weekends was also reported as a role often taken out of necessity. Most interviewees point to the private security sector being a resting home for protective force personal, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“Ex-police and army lads and ones like prison officers that retire and join the sector as security guards [are] looking to run down the clock in a handy number.” (1-06)
The above is representative of interviewees from Ireland, the UK, Canada, and New Zealand. The German and Spanish interviewees reported a higher standard and level of commitment to the role in these regions as did the South-African interviewees. In particular, for frontline security roles it was reported that the sector in South Africa tends to hire from a military background for operational roles due to the early age that personnel retire and reflecting on their high level of training. Minnaar (2007) observes that the introduction of national key point legislation in South Africa in the 1980s increased the demand for high quality security personnel. National key point legislation provides for the protection of sites of national strategic importance against sabotage and allows for the safeguarding of privately owned sites to be protected at all costs, thus recruiting highly trained retired police and military personnel to frontline security guarding roles as the same level of training is not available elsewhere. A notable theme which emerged from American and Canadian interviewees and that is not as prevalent in other countries is that many take up employment in the private security sector to gain experience to join the police. The Canadian interviewee reported that at interviews for law enforcement roles many are advised to join private security to gain experience and, when they have gained that, to re-apply for the law enforcement roles.

In her 1999 ethnographic study, Wakefield indicated that security guards were generally low skilled and entered the sector due to the limited entry criteria. Some interviewees stated that this remains a common theme and suggested that many security guards may not be motivated by, suitable for, or capable of career progression. Another theme, consistent in both literature and participant interviews, was the stop-gap syndrome that presents itself in many forms. These include retired personnel from other occupations and protective forces waiting to retire that Button (2007b) observes, and the ageing low paid and poorly educated white male seen in film and media (Manzo, 2006). Also evident are those people made redundant from low skilled jobs, unable to find other work due to their low skill-set and working in security while waiting to get a better job (Wakefield, 2003), students who use the security sector to pay their way through college (South, 1985), and the crime fighting wannabes that do not make it into the police (Rigokas, 2002).

Referring to the typical background of security managers, Button (2011) notes that this is under-researched, and the little that is known about them is that they are typically ex-police or military. The first study of security managers was conducted in the UK by Hearnden
(1993), who at that time reported that they made up 70% of security manager roles. Wakefield and Button (2014) observe that they continue to make up a large proportion of security managers. In a scoping study of over 400 American private security executives, ASIS (2013) profiles security directors as 93% male, 50 years of age, with 25 years’ sector experience, with 63 percent having a military or police background. A new breed of manager has emerged to expand the typical background of security managers, as explained by the British interviewee:

“Security managers are typically from three disciplines, the armed forces, law enforcement or the spooks, but there is a new breed which is none of the former that come from an academic or business background.” (1-09)

Manunta (1996) categorizes security managers as three differing chess pieces: the ‘Rook’ to describe those from police backgrounds who ignore the preventative aspect and focus on the reactive investigation element, the ‘Knight’ to describe those from military backgrounds who lock things down and strangle the business with their barbed wire approach, and the ‘Bishop’ to describe those from mainstream business backgrounds who take risks. According to most interviewees there is another, which is none of the former, but one who is promoted through private security ranks from security officer to junior and to middle manager roles, best described as the ‘Petered’ one. The Peter Principle put forward by Peter and Hull (1969) suggests the selection of a candidate for a position is typically based on their performance in their current role rather than on qualifications and abilities relevant to the intended role.

These petered ones, according to interviewees, are promoted based on their being good at their current job rather than having the skill-set for the intended role. As one of the Irish interviewees said:

“They give them an extra twenty quid a week to take on a supervisory role but give them no training for the job and usually they are given the job because they always turn up on time, are loyal and trustworthy but seldom are they competent for leading and supervisory jobs.” (1-03)

Briggs and Edwards (2006) indicate that many organizations are beginning to hire security managers from a business background as opposed to traditional security backgrounds. This
is a result of the evolving nature of security management requiring a different set of skills than have the traditionalists. Brooks and Corkill (2014) argue the need for security managers to possess business management skills rather than pure security skills to apply in an enterprise risk management approach. Enterprise risk management is championed by others (ASIS Foundation 2009; Brooks 2010; McGee 2009; Gill et al. 2007, and Wakefield 2014) who identify that modern security managers manage the overall security risk management function and typically operate at board level, fulfilling the CSO function, leading the overall security risk management portfolio. Briggs and Edwards (2006) assert that the modern security manager is a driver of business and is required to aid organizations take calculated risk as opposed to applying traditional lock and bolt prevention solutions; therefore, they need to be well qualified to make such risky decisions.

One of the South African interviewees indicates that over the past 20 years in South Africa ex-protective force personnel no longer make up the typical background of private security managers. This is also the situation in Germany; the reason, according to the German interviewee is that:

“Ex-military security managers are not very much beloved in German private security because they don’t know much about private security.” (1-20)

While there does seem to be a change in some countries with the emerging change of security manager profile, internationally, according to most interviewees the typical background does remain heavily dominated by ex-protective force personnel.

Most interviewees highlighted the previously mentioned petered individual with no police or military background who works their way up the ranks from entry level typically progresses to middle management roles only, as the Canadian interviewee suggested:

“Middle manager is stuck and can’t go anywhere and they are not going to get into these senior ranks. Most of these senior ranks are held by retired CIA, FBI, Law Enforcement or Military Intelligence guys.” (1-17)

This is not confined to the US and Canada and is a view held by interviewees elsewhere as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:
“It’s rare to see an employee from a non-police or military background progress beyond regional manager, and those without a police and military background are stuck in middle management roles, and generally the replacement roles at senior levels are jobs for the boys.” (1-02)

Most interviewees suggest these ex-protective force personnel are promoted to management roles based on previous operational performance and an assumption by those who hire them that they are fully competent based on their perceived security backgrounds. This also applies to the petered non-police and military middle managers who are promoted based on having been good operational practitioners. Therefore, it could be argued that both cohorts are petered into security management positions.

**How is Training and Education Viewed?**

Training and education are two of the main features of a career path according to Carter *et al.* (2009). Interviewees were asked how well the sector engages with training and education. According to most interviewees the sector does not typically engage with training and education unless it is linked to regulation, and is in any case resisted, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“There is no training occurring unless it is linked to regulation and it is viewed very much as a necessary evil.” (1-02)

Another Irish interviewee summed up the general attitude towards training:

“Training is done under duress and paid for under duress.” (1-01)

The Australian interviewee reported that security guards, security managers and ex-protective force security managers generally do view education and qualifications as adding value; however, most interviewees felt that those who engage security and security contractors do not share the same opinion. Another Irish interviewee makes the point that all security providers are spending on mandatory training and have no budget left for non-mandatory training. However, others disagree, some identifying that before regulation there was little voluntary training occurring and that the cost of regulation is being used as an excuse not to deliver training.
Referring to security guards, most interviewees indicate that once mandatory training is complete there is little follow-on training, as highlighted by one of the Irish interviewees:

“There is very little training occurring after mandatory training. On-site induction focused on learning does not happen and there is no requirement for refresher training or up-skilling. It is down to cost in most cases, the staff are just not invested in and the bottom line is the important thing; remember this is a business; they are in it for the money not the public interest.” (1-07)

Most interviewees refer to mandatory training as going through the motions as it is mandatory and has to be completed and delivered by trainers who have little or no private security credentials and little credibility, as illustrated by Canadian, British, New Zealand and Irish interviewees:

“It's training for the sake of training, the transfer of learning is very poor and some trainers are only in it for a quick buck.” (1-19)

“The trainers only need a training qualification and don’t need much subject matter and are often delivered by ex-cops because it is believed they must know about security but their background is not private security.” (1-17)

“Trainees are helped through the exams and there have been cases of trainers selling certs (sic) without ever doing the training and its fraud and criminal on so many levels.” (1-06)

“The assessments are too easy for them to pass and if they can't do it themselves they get helped through it.” (1-05)

In a competency based licensing model, which is the typical one in most regions, the applicant first has to prove they have successfully completed a training course and part of their application includes criminal background screening. If they provide a certificate of competence and prove to be a fit and proper person following background screening they are issued a license to work. However, one of the Irish interviewees highlights a contentious issue presented by poor assessment technique and supervision:
“Licenses get issued to applicants based on the fact they have a cert (sic) proving their competence. The issue is they may not be competent due to having been helped through the exam or [their] papers marked incorrectly and the regulator provides them [with] a license based on their so-called competence. This questions the whole system and questions their ability and role in the public interest.” (1-01)

*KOMSI,* A European project from 2010 to 2012, tested the competence levels of a sample twenty security guards. The project group comprised private security practitioners, public policing representatives, trade union and trade representative bodies, and a group of security educators and academics that developed a series of questions to test the candidates. They based their questions on the mandatory training the candidates previously received that allowed them gain a license from their regulator, thus deemed competent and a capable guardian. The volunteer candidates working as security guards were tested under normal test centre criterion and supervised for the duration of the exam. The *KOMSI* project group found that most candidates did not pass and they questioned the mandatory training assessment criterion of security guards in the mainstream European security sector and their ability at capable guardianship.

Fraudulent examinations were exposed by the British current affairs programme *Panorama* in 2008. The programme also highlighted some criminals hiding behind the title of security consultant. In the UK and in Ireland, security consultants remain an unlicensed activity, therefore presenting a gap in regulation.

The relevance of mandatory training was questioned by some interviewees. Some suggested the training is too generic and not specific to the sector to which it applies. For instance, those working in healthcare, pharmaceutical, retail and manufacturing all complete the same training. This is a point made by the Canadian interviewee who asserts that for every area of business there is a natural specialism; however, security guards typically complete a generic basic mandatory course with no progression to the specialism subject, and when they go to the relevant sector no specialized training is provided. According to some interviewees this is a result of the lack of specialized follow-on training being available for specific industry.
British and Irish interviewees reported that mandatory training does not consider physical intervention training for a role that requires they defend themselves and others. In 2015, a report written by the Australian national training regulator, the Australian Skills Quality Authority, argued that inconsistent licensing arrangements and poor training posed risks to the public due to security guards not carrying out their duties safely.

Follow-on mandatory training does exist within New Zealand and South Africa according to interviewees from these countries. This follow-on path allows progression to supervisory and junior manager roles as previously highlighted. Positively, this means there is a defined progression route available; however, akin to security officer training there is just a requirement to acquire the skill and there is no refresher training required.

CoESS (2011) defines security managers as those who influence operations. Yet, ironically, mandatory training is not widely required for these evidently influential positions. Within the EU, security managers in just 50 per cent of countries undertake mandatory training and, like security guards, they are not required to refresh or update their skills. In common with arrangements in New Zealand and South Africa, this training is vocational level management training. For this reason the security manager competence level equates to lower level management competences when compared with other occupations; thus this creates a negative perception of security managers as illustrated by British and Irish interviewees:

“You are not viewed as a graduate, but as just someone from a security company.” (1-09)

“When people ask what I do and I say I am a security manager they assume I mean security officer and I am viewed at a much lower level and not taken seriously by peers in other industry.” (1-06)

In South Africa and the UK there is a growing range of higher education options in security risk management from universities; these are available up to doctorate level. In South Africa there is a higher level option for security management that is very well supported by the South African security sector according to one of the South African interviewees. However, in other regions it is less progressive. For instance, in Ireland, Spain, Italy, Germany, Canada, and New Zealand there is no availability and in America it
is available through second rate universities, according to one of the American interviewees. This, interviewees suggested, compounds the fact that security is not recognised as a management discipline in its own right.

The non-recognition of security management as a discipline is seen by most interviewees as having a negative impact as it means there is limited availability and engagement in higher education, and this could have a knock-on effect on the availability of education and the quality of security provision, as one Irish interviewee explained:

“If there are no available university qualifications or is no engagement in education it has an impact on security management as a discipline and the provision of a quality service. If you consider a medical professional they will have qualifications relevant to their role and [they] do not carry out their job unless they are suitably qualified. Generally most jobs are like this; you will need a honours degree or Masters degree for example to do certain jobs, but it seems anyone can do security work at any level and don’t need to be qualified.” (1-01)

The same interviewee further indicated that because of the lack of security management educational opportunities decisions are made by executives and managers from other disciplines with no security credentials:

“Security managers generally do not have strategic decision-making responsibility; generally they end up being the ones that decisions get funneled through, being told what to do by someone with no, or limited, security experience and credentials, and their decisions are not made based on proven academic theories.” (1-01)

This was a point made by the US Office of Personnel Management (1987) who asserted that security management is largely administered by senior management within organizations who have no proven security management expertise. One of the American interviewees indicated that most security managers do not sit on boards and the reasons are partly that they are unable to communicate security risk management in business language, thus not influencing security operations. ASIS (2013) suggest that security is not recognized as a discipline due to the low body of scientific knowledge of the sector and the low level of engagement in training and education, impacting on career paths.
Higher education that is available is inconsistent, according to one of the American interviewees who highlighted that there are no national or international standards and suggested that this impacts on mobility across countries and regions. A review of security risk management degree and Masters degree courses throughout the world highlights this, with no two courses the same; therefore, there is no common set of competences for security managers. This suggests that the roles remain undefined. Adendorff (2009) observes a plethora of security academic qualifications all at different levels but no single qualification that is set as the benchmark. Some interviewees assert that the lack of a common set of competences for sector practitioners is problematic and according to British and Irish interviewees it is only security guards at a low basic level that have defined common competences as previously highlighted.

Interviewees in Canada and New Zealand suggested that the UK is the leader in security management higher education. Some interviewees indicated that as a result of limited or no undergraduate and postgraduate opportunities practitioners have to travel and study abroad. They suggest that only small amounts do and, therefore, many practitioners do not engage in higher level education. Notably, most interviewees indicated there is no great expectation amongst sector leaders and those who buy security for practitioners to have higher level security risk management qualifications.

Security practitioner certifications do exist; according to most interviewees the most widely recognized is the ASIS Certified Protection Professional (CPP) designation. They suggested that the CPP is almost a prerequisite for security management practitioner roles. Interviewees indicated the qualification is practical rather than theoretically orientated and is not mapped to a qualification framework. The CPP could fall under the category of LLL as there is an ongoing requirement to refresh and up-skill. Failure to engage in this Continuous Professional Development (CPD) means the practitioner loses their designation and can no longer use the post-nominal CPP. The CPP amongst security manager practitioners is widely embraced by those who buy security in the US according to the American interviewees, although, elsewhere it is less popular according to one of the American interviewees:

“The CPP doesn’t travel well or hold the same weight across the globe as it does here.” (1-14)
Some interviewees argued this is because it is voluntary. However, any review of security manager job vacancies shows that the majority of hirers, particularly in the US or American employers in other regions, require that the applicant has a CPP.

The German interviewee reported that clients in Germany are starting to ask practitioners to have higher level education due to the evolving nature of security risk management, the threat of crime, and the requirement to adhere to a growing suite of quality standards.

Some interviewees observed that the evolving nature of security risk management is slowly recruiting more qualified personnel. This is seen in America as ASIS (2013) reports 37% of top security directors now hold a Masters degree. In the UK, the Register of Chartered Security Professionals (RCSyP) was established in 2011 by the Worshipful Company of Security Professionals following its achievement of Royal Charter status, with the Security Institute managing the Register on its behalf. The process to be recognized as a CSyP involves a comprehensive documentation procedure of the candidate’s competences in security related subjects as well as an interview. However, like the CPP, it is voluntary, and reviewing the public register of CSyPs on the Security Institute website it would suggest that the number of its members that are not CSyPs heavily outweighs those that are.

The attitude towards training is generally poor, as highlighted by one of the Irish interviewees:

“Training is viewed very much as a necessary evil and as a means to get a license to get a job.” (1-04)

Another Irish interviewee suggested that:

“The attitude towards training is very poor and more often than not training is done under duress and paid for under duress.” (1-03)

Mandatory entry level qualifications provide limited career development opportunities according to most interviewees, and they suggested that the focus is not on preparation for the next stage of a career. As Kezeli (2016) points out, private security personnel can play an essential role in crime prevention, but if they are not properly trained or educated they
could create a substantial risk to themselves, their employer, and their customer, as well as those involved who they are trying to either protect or restrain. However, while it is clear that training is not generally embraced, the majority of interviewees argued that without regulation there would be little engagement in training.

**What are the Barriers to Progression?**

All interviewees suggested that advancing a career in the sector is challenging with a number of barriers for progression evident. There are several reasons for this, and these are discussed in turn below.

As previously highlighted, defined roles and responsibilities are a key element of a career path. Interviewees observed that the plethora of security titles and roles that mean the same leads to confusion of what a role is or is not, and what experience or qualification a candidate should typically possess to apply. They argued that this lack of commonality is off-putting to candidates, and if the sector itself does not know what they’re doing this sends a negative message to those considering entering the sector, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“The industry is confused, they don’t have a clue what jobs are what and particularly in the contract sector there is a host of titles all meaning the same thing but no clear experience or qualification requirements for the applicant. If you are new to security it is better go somewhere where they already know who they are and what they’re doing.” (1-04)

With the exception of entry level frontline guarding roles, arguably defined by regulation, the knock-on-effect is that there is no common set of competences mapped to a defined qualification framework to which a suite of training and educational programmes can be aligned. For those who want to enter the sector or progress within it, they have no model they can look to that can guide them on their career options.

All interviewees held the view that security is not seen as a management discipline of its own, resulting in no perceived requirement for such a role at senior management and executive level. The previously mentioned PWC (2013) study surveyed 9,300 executives from 128 countries and found that only 40% of organisations employ a CSO in charge of their security programme. Some interviewees highlighted that strategic and operational
security management decisions are often made by accountants and other managers with no security credentials. The result of this is that poor security management decisions are being made and these impact on the training of security personnel. The PWC study also found that 51% of the respondents said that they have people dedicated to employee awareness programmes for internal policies, procedures and technical standards. As Kezeli (2016) argues, people who do not know how to do things rarely do them well, which makes that lack of resources available for security training a significant problem.

Security management not seen as its own discipline is a result of the low level body of knowledge of who the security manager is, what they do, and how they can add value (Brooks, 2010; Brooks and Corkill, 2013; Lippert et al. 2013). Promotion is typically from within where people are petered into management positions as already highlighted, and this type of progression does not provide the best pathway, as suggested by the Australian interviewee:

“It impacts career paths as promotion is from within and that doesn’t necessarily have the best pathway without development.” (1-18)

The lack of understanding of what constitutes a security manager is problematic. For instance, Brooks and Corkill (2014) suggest that corporate security is not part of the wider security sector and seen as a different discipline industry to contract security; however, some interviewees disagreed and some felt this was down to their own perceived elitism status, as illustrated by an Irish interviewee:

“The contract security sector and in-house security are different but for career paths there should be a route from contract security manager to in-house security manager, but it strikes me there is some snobbery in the corporate world of contract security managers.” (1-08)

There is a view among some interviewees that in-house security managers have a narrow skill-set and that contract security managers may indeed be better-rounded generalists, as one of the American interviewees observes:

“Security managers from the private sector deal with a wide range of business issues because they have to, that the security manager in a specific functional role
may not so you might find contrary to belief by some that the contract one may have a wider set of skills.” (1-13)

The narrow skill-set of corporate security managers is a result of the large existence of ex-protective force personnel according to all interviewees who questioned this cohort’s employment agenda. Button (2011) argues that they opt for the private security sector as a second career to top up their pensions. Borodzic and Gibson (2006) hold the same view, referring to them as "second careerists" and "pension toppers", and they argue that they are not interested in their own professional development and career progression, thus they do not promote it.

Many of these ex-protective force security managers also take up security consulting roles. The problem, though, with security consultants is that most are providing the highest level advice without any proven competence according to most interviewees. The other issue is that in the majority of cases it is ex-police or military that are given the work due to their perceived background, as suggested by British and New Zealand interviewees:

“I was at a meeting recently where there were two ex-special forces providing military level advice to a mainstream business that was not practical, they were planning for a nuclear weapon attack, what they were doing was providing advice that would strangle the business and close them down.” (1-10)

“How does a guy who worked with a dog and a flashlight patrolling the streets for years all of a sudden come out of the police and advise on security systems and procedures, they didn't do it in the police so how do they get away with it in the private sector?” (1-19)

Then there are the private sector security consultants who have been regulated in some regions, for instance Canada. However, there is no focus on training and standards. Instead, the criterion is that they pay a license fee to their regulator as illustrated by the Canadian interviewee:

“Yeah they need a license but it is a tax grab only get a license based on police clearance and you don’t have to show any proof of education or qualifications; it's
a joke and it’s just an opportunity for them to take more money from the business community.” (1-17)

The other form of security consultant according to some interviewees is employed by the big accountancy management firms specialising in risk management. However, there is a feeling that these do not understand security as a discipline and they also provide the wrong solutions, according to one of the Irish interviewees:

“I own a car and I consider myself to understand how it works, and if I hear a noise I generally could tell you what might be wrong but don't ask me to open the bonnet and give me the spanners to tell you exactly what is wrong and how to fix it as I am not a mechanic.” (1-01)

Most interviewees criticize the hiring practices within the sector; they suggest that there is no general standard for hiring or benchmarking against recruited and retired protective force personnel because it is assumed these are most suitable to fulfill these roles because of their backgrounds, although, they have no understanding of private security, as highlighted by the German interviewee:

“They are not very beloved in German private security because they don't know about private security, how could they, they are policemen and this is different.” (1-20)

Furthermore, they tend to be older when they take up roles, thus creating an ageing security manager profile which impacts on the development of young career-driven practitioners, as highlighted by this Irish interviewee:

“There is an assumption that 20 years’ experience in the police or military means they are better candidates than younger driven non-police and military people.” (1-04)

The same interviewee suggested there is no definition on experience either, and explained this based on their personal experience of a former co-worker:
“This guy I worked with spent 20 years in the army band playing the triangle, yet he is now in a senior security management role based on the fact that he has a military background.” (1-04)

He further reports of a current colleague who used to be in the police:

“It is funny you mention the hiring process within the sector, there is this guy I work with who used to be in the police and we currently have a job vacancy for a security officer and in conversation he says that we should not hire from the private sector as security roles are suitable only to retired police and military and he says that security is not for young people.” (1-04)

Button (2011) refers to the negative effect the dominance of personnel with police and military backgrounds have on the development of the sector’s personnel. He suggests they bring a second career mentality to the position and create a domino effect of hiring their own when they retire, thus perpetuating the cycle and stifling progression opportunities. Many interviewees echoed White’s (2010) assertions that former high ranking ex-police and military are brought into senior positions to give a sense of credibility and legitimacy due to a perceived government policing stamp of approval. One of the Irish interviewees observes they are happy to take on a role knowing they do not know what they are doing:

“I remember a senior military officer landing a significant security manager job, but I won’t say where, but he rang me up delighted but quickly said to me I haven’t a clue what I’m meant to be doing.” (1-02)

Another Irish interviewee highlighted the problem with hiring low ranking military personnel:

“They spend most of their time on sentry duties, but when they come out they all of a sudden are able to start up security companies and run a business but they have no prior business or people management experience in the private sector to draw on to be successful.” (1-03)
The New Zealand interviewee referred to the societal myth amongst private sector employers that by hiring former police and military that they get a competent private security professional:

“Somehow a policeman who spent all his life patrolling the streets transcribes into being a security consultant on retirement providing high-end advice on business prevention measures.” (1-19)

All interviewees indicated there is a major difference between private security and security within the police and military. Button (2011) argues that there is a prevailing view among the public and those that employ them that these ex-protective forces personnel must be competent to take up private security roles due to their backgrounds, as the Canadian interviewee expressed:

“You see it in pop culture that somehow mysteriously if you are in law enforcement or the military that it transfers to being a security expert.” (1-17)

Button (2011) indicates this cohort of former police and military do not engage heavily in training and education. Some interviewees contend that this is due to the perception by themselves and others that their former backgrounds signify competence. However, most interviewees’ perception is that many of them suffer from the Peter Principle theory, as the following Irish interviewee illustrates:

“The buyer may often deem security expertise coming from a myopic background such as policing and military, where some of these may suffer from the Peter Principle where they rise to their own level of incompetence and believe their own spoof.” (1-01)

The problem this presents is that ex-protective force security managers may be creating a glass ceiling, according to one of the American interviewees, which may convey that private security roles are only available to ex-police and military personnel. Consequently, existing employees may not have real progression opportunity, and those outside the sector might view the sector as a closed one and not a viable career option. There was a common theme amongst most interviewees that there is an old boys’ network that exists.
Interviewees agreed that because they are not interested in developing themselves they are not interested in developing others.

Employers employ this cohort in the private sector as they believe they are the most suitably qualified according to most interviewees. However, some interviewees cautioned this mindset, and as two of the Irish interviewees illustrated:

“They do a very dangerous thing by assuming competence.” (1-01)

“They think they are the best ones for the job because they were in the army or the police and must know about security but the issue here is that they don't understand themselves what they are hiring because they don't know what security actually is and what it does or should do in an organization and then you have the other extreme of accountants making security management decisions based on knowledge of what, what is their expertise in security.” (1-08)

A further element associated with progression and promotion through the ranks is length of service, as suggested by one of the Irish interviewees:

“Putting in time and seniority is historically how people progress through the ranks, and it is rare that people progress based on ability and being qualified and as a result many of the good ones move on to other industry where objective career progression opportunities exist.” (1-09)

There is a view among some of the interviewees that the path to both in-house and contract security management positions depends on if the individual had a high ranking prior police or military position, as one the Irish interviewees illustrated:

“The more senior security management positions within state bodies and corporate departments are kept for former high ranking police and army personnel.” (1-02)

The same interviewee indicated that lesser ranked police and military personnel end up working in the commercial contract security sector or start their own private contract manned guarding security provider or investigations company.
Most interviewees suggested the over reliance on this cohort and not finding ways of providing opportunity for non-protective force personnel is damaging to career progression both inside and outside the sector. Gill et al. (2013) assert that those who buy security are significant sector stakeholders who dictate service, training, pay and conditions. Interviewees suggested that many of these buyers of security do not understand the difference between state and private security, resulting in them stifling progression opportunities by hiring ex-protective force personnel as they believe they are the only ones who can competently fulfil the role of security manager.

Clearly, sector leadership predominately comes from ex-protective force personnel both in the contract sector and in-house corporate security units reflecting on their majority. Wakefield and Button (2014) indicate these are the key cultural agents of change. Button (2011) asserts that ex-protective force personnel are sending a message to those they lead that professional development is not important for career advancement. Most interviewees highlighted that while they do bring certain behavioural and attitudinal competences and skills such as investigation for instance, they are not suitable for the private sector as the skill-set gained in public policing is not relevant to private security and the business world. This is one of the reasons why they are not representative at board level, according to Briggs and Edwards (2006), and potentially a cause of security management not being recognized as a management discipline as they struggle to speak business language, according to one of the American interviewees.

Their lack of engagement in training and education is seen as a key barrier for progression within the sector, and indeed security being an attractive career option, as there is limited support or promotion of professional development according to most interviewees. Hearnden’s (1993) British study of security managers identified them as coming from policing or military backgrounds with few having qualifications relevant to their private security role. As earlier highlighted security manager research is sparse, but Martin’s (2008) scoping study of the Irish private security sector suggests little has changed; most interviewees agreed likewise.

One of the foundations of professionalism is the existence of well-developed training and education, according to Wakefield (2014). She further notes that while these terms are closely related they are different, education being a lifelong learning process promoting general knowledge, while training is focused on specific skills. Education and training are
also key elements of a structured career path (Carter et al. 2009; Cao and Thomas, 2013). When asked about engagement in CPD, one of the Irish interviewees summarized the view opined by most interviewees who were explaining the general attitude security managers have towards LLL:

“They don't even know what CPD is, if you asked them they would think it is some form of disease.” (1-03)

The education path for all learners in any industry is generally at vocational level through to higher education (Beer, 2007), and certain jobs require either vocational or higher education qualifications. For frontline security officers there is a requirement for vocational training with the focus on training rather than education according to interviewees who indicated that this training is low level mandatory training required by regulators. Most interviewees report that training is regarded as acquiring the skill to apply for a license to get a job, rather than on acquiring the skill to do the job. Furthermore, they report that this training is not focused on education, nor does it prepare the learner for progression to the next competence. Instead, it is seen as a paper-trail exercise to satisfy auditors, as expressed by one of the Irish interviewees:

“Mandatory training is seen as a means to get a license to get a job, but no education takes place. Training is about covering one’s backside and is just a tick box exercise.” (1-05)

Interviewees reported that for entry level security guards there is a view that mandatory training is the maximum standard; however, mandatory training is the minimum required standard according to regulators. Meanwhile, some interviewees suggested that this is not the view shared by the sector that does not encourage training and education, and it is not viewed as a means of progression. The lack of voluntary training was a notable concern of Martin’s (2008) scoping study of the Irish security sector. Button (2011) suggests that this is primarily due to how management is structured and their poor attitude towards training.

Interviewees indicated that the sector does not offer graduate programme opportunities or mentoring, lacks young talent coming through and remains heavily male-dominated, as explained by the following British and Irish interviewees:
“There are no graduate programmes like you see in other industry and with the exception of a few of the innovate organizations there is no mentoring either.” (1-09)

“The heavy dominance of men in the sector is not healthy and we need more women, they can do the job just as well but without them there is a message sent that it’s a man’s job and don’t apply unless you’re male.”(1-11)

“There is no young talent coming through caused by the culture within the industry of not developing its people or seeing the need to.” (1-02)

The foundations of sector training and education are not built, according to most interviewees, and there is limited opportunity to engage in education due to the limited availability of higher level security management training; indeed this is seen as a barrier for progression. However, they also indicated there is a poor attitude among practitioners who have been in the sector for a long time and do not engage in it, or place value on it; this was considered by most interviewees as a problem for professionalising the sector. They also suggested that it is detrimental for the recognition of security risk management as a discipline. One of the Irish interviewees suggested that as a result of security management not being widely recognized as a discipline in its own right, it is not a viable career option.

According to some interviewees the integration model that has appeared over the last decade is linked to this aspect of security management not being recognized as a management discipline of its own. The Australian interviewee felt this was particularly prominent in large organizations. Gill et al. (2013) suggest that those who buy security are diluting it as a discipline by integrating it into facilities management. Most interviewees supported their view that this may be to the detriment of security as a management discipline, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“There appears to be a shift towards integrated managers and a huge mistake being made is the security manager also being cleaning or facilities manager. You can only be an expert in one area. A person should have the expertise in a particular area to deliver a top quality service and if they are experts in cleaning or facilities they won't deliver a top quality service in security.” (1-03)
Most interviewees highlighted that those who buy security also create progression barriers by accepting the lowest end bids, thus there is no room for financial investment in pay and conditions and training and education. This also impacts on service quality, as explained by this Irish interviewee:

“They must take responsibility for change which impacts career paths as the lowest end bidder gets the lowest end contract with the expectation of the highest end delivery in environments carrying the highest risk.” (1-01)

All interviewees suggested that poor pay and conditions and the lack of development opportunities contributed heavily to the stop gap syndrome. Nalla & Wakefield (2014) highlight continuing poor working conditions within the sector. To put this into context, and considering the dangerous environments security personnel work in, the Canadian interviewee reported that:

“Staff in coffee shops get better remunerated to pour coffee.” (1-17)

One of the Irish interviewees referred to the fast food chain McDonalds, stating:

“You get paid more to work in McDonalds and you do not get abused or spat at.” (1-06)

Gill et al.(2013) offer an observation on the significant turnover of security staff, and as previously highlighted, they present the top reasons people leave security roles as poor pay and conditions, not feeling appreciated and no career development and progression opportunities. This confirms what most interviewees suggested, that there is a failing of basic human recourse development principles within the sector. However, there is a view amongst some interviewees that the contract sector’s concern is not with developing their employees but instead on their bottom line. One of the Irish interviewees explained:

“The mantra amongst contract companies is ‘fill the shift, keep the contract, get new business’. It is not focused on developing its staff to do this just on profits and what they get out of it.” (1-04)
Referring to contract sector management, the German interviewee indicated:

“They don’t invest in qualifications and people as they look at the next contract always.” (1-20)

Sector leadership is weak, according to most interviewees, particularly towards encouraging professional development amongst practitioners. They indicated that the availability of training and education is consistent with the demand for it. They felt that they do not invest in developing their staff because they believe their staff will move on elsewhere. However, some interviewees suggested that it is not all one-sided and that national and multi-national companies do make follow-on training available; however, the latter is typically not taken up by employees who are not interested in progression and that others look for excuses, as one of the British interviewees illustrated:

“Those who are not progressing make excuses.” (1-10)

There is a view amongst interviewees that those who do get on in the sector carve out their own career pathway, and that the individual must also accept responsibility for their own development. It is difficult for new entrants, according to some interviewees who indicated that you get on based on who you know, rather than what you know. Getting on based on what you know should be the way, according to one of the British interviewees who asserted that this is the cornerstone of being successful.

Some interviewees felt that a further progression barrier impacting on career paths is the scarcity of specific sector scientific researchers who create the body of knowledge that underpins an occupation. Stenning (1994) observes that private policing is still very much in its infancy and he believes there is still so much to be written due to the lack of knowledge of the sector. Some interviewees indicated that there is limited research on what a security practitioner does, who they are, and how they do it, particularly at management level. Established occupations have theories which impact what they do, however, according to one of the British interviewees:

“You do what you know not what everyone should know and do because the sector is built on nothing.” (1-10)
One of the Irish interviewees indicated that without a body of knowledge security risk management is not recognized as a management discipline or taken seriously by academia. There has recently been a growth spurt in sector pracademics in the form of private security practitioner researchers, according to one of the British interviewees; however, the numbers do remain small, according to the Canadian interviewee. The research they are carrying out is critical toward advancing the sector as their theories should inform practice, but it is not being funneled through to the sector in a language they understand, according to one of the British interviewees. Therefore, practitioners may not be making decisions based on the latest theoretical thinking and the elements of sector career paths may not be scientifically understood or defined.

Some interviewees indicated that the security guard is blind to the latest thinking and career advancement tools. However, there is a view amongst some interviewees that practitioners do not feel the need to be informed by research as many are not willing to ‘learn to learn’. Learning to learn is a critical element of lifelong learning, according to the European Commission (2006).

Perception is a powerful ‘thing’, creating our sensory experience of the world around us involving the cognitive processes required to process information of how something is or is not, created by the sender and interpreted by receiver (Harvey, 2010). The Australian interviewee suggested that the media assists in creating a negative view of security guards. Manzo (2006) shares this view, referring to several examples within television, film and the media of the unprofessional and incompetent nature of the private security sector. Most interviewees felt that a perception of sector unprofessionalism will not attract candidates to a career in security.

The sector itself is not innocent in portraying unprofessional and incompetent practices, particularly notable with the delivery of security solutions to the 2012 London Olympics and the aftermath that witnessed their Chief Executive quit his post following the perceived fiasco. The chairman of the Commons Home Affairs Committee, Keith Vaz, referred to the payoff to him of £1.2 million as astonishing given his role and the perceived reward for spectacular failure. More recently, they were abuse claims at a youth institution in the UK and, separately, the current affairs programme Panorama uncovering alleged falsified reporting by security guards they had made in order to prevent fines for losing control. Most interviewees indicated that some within the sector contribute to this due to
the poor general management skills and level of expertise and training of its staff, and its focus on profit rather than service delivery and the public interest.

There is the stereotype security sector as illustrated by Livingstone and Hart (2010) that portrays its personnel as hired guns, untrustworthy and the incompetent watchman. The continuous reference to the, now dated, 1971 Rand Report depicting security personnel as low skilled and aging white males is not constructive. Further studies such as that of South (1985) when he went undercover with a number of security providers did not show the sector in a good light, nor did Lofstrand et al. (2015). On reflection, in the absence of up-to-date positive research, the negative images delivered by the sector do not encourage people to join. Some interviewees held this view, and others indicated that there are a number of security guards who will tell others they are only working in the sector for the time being until something better comes along and they are not proud of their identity, as illustrated by two of the Irish interviewees:

“They are embarrassed of what they do and they say ah it's handy for paying a few bills and I'm just waiting on a call to start another job but they are not and they are focused on getting out.” (1-07)

“I know this guy who works for a security company who takes off his uniform jumper when going out to lunch or the shop to avoid people knowing he is a security guard and I know another who pretends to work for the client in facilities to avoid people thinking he works as a security guard.” (1-04)

It appears that the sector is not alone in finding it difficult to attract the best candidates; it also struggles to empower and motivate those already employed to take pride in what they are and what they do. With security guards continuing to be stigmatized as doing dirty work and a job for those who are good at nothing else, nobody would want to do security work, thus making it difficult to see how the sector can attract the best candidates.

The size of private security providers is seen to impact on career paths, according to most interviewees. There is a view amongst them that large national and multinational security providers may have their own internal career paths linked to their size and ability to provide a career path due to their resources, vast services and the infrastructure required to support their structure. Some interviewees opined that large security providers are in the
minority and that there are a number of small family run private security contractors who make up the majority of providers. A particular reason for the lack of career path opportunities is that many of these companies are owner-managed and the management responsibilities of the business are passed down through the family. The view amongst some interviewees was that these small family run businesses either may not or may not need to see the benefit in developing career paths as their aspiration is not related to career advancement. More often than not the supervisor is the best a security guard can aspire to, as one of the Irish interviewees explained:

“Supervisor is the best you could hope for in most companies, you could be in a company for 20 years waiting for the management position which is filled by the owner and your only prospects is if the owner dies, sells, or the supervisor leaves.” (1-02)

The sector is historically associated with high turnover at frontline level; however, junior management roles are less transient according to one of the British interviewees, who suggested that:

“The reality for security guards is that they could progress to supervisor but the turnover of site managers is low so where does the supervisor go.” (1-07)

The same interviewee suggested ad hoc progression routes exist and referred to the example of door supervisors who work on licensed premises and the natural progression for these being to close protection; however, this interviewee suspects there is nowhere further a close protection officer can progress to.

One of the American interviewees suggested that the barriers for progression are typically self-imposed and highlighted a lack of common competencies and qualifications between states, provinces and countries, impacting both mobility and a common approach to security risk management internationally. A further progression barrier according to most interviewees is the lack of a competence framework. Tuck (2007) suggests that competence frameworks are critical in allowing employers to choose the best qualified employee for a position while also allowing a new entrant or existing employee to align themselves to roles and to identify what further skills they require to progress. A lack of engagement in training for the right reasons - to learn - was seen as a progression barrier
by some interviewees, as was the lack of mandatory CPD requirements. They suggested that it is too easy to enter and remain in the sector due to the lack of entry criteria for most roles; according to one of the British interviewees the bar is set too low and the role attracts those who struggle to find work in other industry. Wakefield (2003) suggests that the low entry criterion is a reason for the sector attracting low skilled personnel with no career aspirations. One of the British interviewees indicated that for many:

“They end up finding a warm comfortable retreat.” (1-10)

Discussion
The purpose of this chapter was to establish how well developed career paths are. Structured career paths that are underpinned by training and education standards that provide the lattice and ladder movement for progression do not exist. Within the contract sector there is arguably a defined entry level career path to basic manned guarding roles. This is created by regulation in most countries. In New Zealand and South Africa regulation has created progression to junior management roles. While regulation may have provided entry criteria, it is only entry to generic guarding roles and it has failed to raise the entry standard to a level that challenges a candidate’s ability. Furthermore regulation has been unable to enforce the assessment criteria in these countries to an applicable standard. Furthermore, in most regions regulation has only concentrated on entry level roles and has not regulated higher level security management and consultant security roles. Moreover, they have arguably created a regulation gap that poses risk to the public interest.

Some of the larger contractor security providers do have their own internal career pathways. This has happened as a result of their having to do so reflecting their size and resource demand. However, large security providers are in the minority. The majority of security providers are small medium enterprises (SME) that do not have the structure to create career paths. Moreover, they are generally owned by former protective force personnel or are small family-run businesses. In many of these SMEs the owner assumes the role of general manager, financial controller, roster manager, health and safety manager, HR manager, supervisor and patrol driver, and, when needed, they will cover shifts as a security guard. These types of providers are not interested in creating career pathways. The contract sector suffers from a drive to the bottom to gain contracts, and their mantra is about making profit rather than developing their only asset, their people.
There is no typical security guard background. There is a cohort that does not want to be in the contract security sector and wants to be somewhere else. They are looking for an opportunity to leave rather than progress within; they are often skilled people from other occupations who use the security sector as a stop gap until something better comes along. There is a ‘wannabe somewhere else’ culture caused by poor pay and working conditions, a lack of appreciation, no investment in staff and limited progression opportunities. Those that do want to be working in the sector are there as a result of the low level entry criterion. They have found a warm comfortable retreat, this attracts them to the security sector for the wrong reasons and this group are not interested in progressing. Security guards who do want to progress are promoted based on showing good operational performance. They are given token gesture salary increases to take on the extra responsibility of leading people and keeping environments safe and secure. However, seldom are they promoted based on proven competence for the intended role; instead they are petered into management roles based on their ability to do their previous role. Furthermore, they are generally not provided with the training and education they need for their new role.

This cohort only progress to junior and middle manager roles. This is due to the senior contract security manager roles being filled by ex-protective force personnel retired from the police and military or, otherwise, the owner being the senior manager. Like their junior manager counterparts, these ex-protective force personnel are hired based on operational performance in their previous role in the police and the military rather than the skills required for the intended private sector role. They are hired to give an air of legitimacy to the security contractor’s business activities. Contract security is not seen as a professional role, however, those from the police and military are credible in the eyes of society, and therefore this perception suits the profit-making potential of security providers. However, a glass ceiling has been created for those without police and military backgrounds and there is no progression model for them to advance; as a result they get stuck or they move on. This has created a sense of unfairness and has the potential to create sub-cultures. Furthermore, they have created an ageing workforce that is male dominated, that has resulted in a lack of diversity and hindered young talent coming through.

There are some very good generalist managers operating within the contract sector who have a wide-ranging skill-set gained in a dynamic service sector business environment. For these who want to progress, corporate security management is where these managers want to go. Corporate security is seen as an elite role, and it provides better defined career
pathways that cater for upward and sideward movement. The evident problem is that there is no defined career pathway from contract to corporate security; furthermore they are seen as having different job functions making it difficult to transition. The contract security manager is perceived as not doing security; they are better described as a human resource client relationship manager. They are not seen as having the “real” security risk management skills such as being able to carry out threat assessments and develop security management systems required of a corporate security manager.

The perceived skills for this security risk management function are seen as coming from the police or military. As a result, ex-protective force personnel hold these jobs. However, there is prevailing view that this group are not the best ones for these roles as private security and public policing are very different disciplines and their experience is not relevant. However, there is a school of thought that they do bring certain skills not found in the private sector and they are best suited to the traditional locks and bolts security role; however they should not be matched to the contemporary corporate security risk management role as the skills needed for this are considerably different. There is another school of thought that they are hired for the top corporate security management roles because it is assumed they must be qualified due to their previous backgrounds. Those that hire them directly or via the contract sector do not understand what security is and what it is should do, therefore, they end up hiring the wrong people based on their lack of knowledge of security as a business function. The uncertainty of what security roles mean is largely due to the hirers and buyers of security not understanding security as a science and their specific roles as leaders of change. Additionally, security is not seen as a management discipline, resulting from the low body of knowledge being created to underpin the occupation and its roles.

The ex-police and military cohort do not engage in training and education and as leaders do not promote it. They, and others, perceive themselves as suitably competent. However, there is a slow realisation among hirers and buyers of security that these are not the ones capable of taking on the ever-changing corporate security risk management role. Security risk managers are now emerging from business and academic backgrounds.

The other group that has emerged as security risk managers are accountants. However, these are not seen as the right fit either even though they are very well educated, have Chartered status and understand risk management. They are not experienced or schooled in
traditional security risk management methods of crime and loss prevention and are not their areas. Arguably, they are not best placed to make security risk management decisions on their own as their decision making may be clouded by the need to save money. The development in accountants taking on these senior security risk management roles has created a glass ceiling, akin to what has occurred with ex-police and military. Accountancy is its own occupation and its own profession. Crime and loss prevention are not part of their curriculum. Yet in the absence of the right fit, security risk management strategy is being set both by accountants and retired police and military. This is largely as a result of the contemporary top of the ladder corporate security management role still not being universally fully defined.

Clearly defined roles and responsibilities are a key element of career paths. Within the sector, with the exception of entry level basic guarding, these are not well defined. The sector and its roles are esoteric and disparate with a plethora of them meaning the same. There are no clearly defined roles that naturally progress from one role to the next or provide for progression from the contract sector to corporate security.

The sector does not have a defined competence model that aligns roles and qualifications. Training and education are key components of a competence model. The contract sector does not place value on training and education. Training and education are seen as necessary evils, driven by mandatory regulatory requirements and paid for and completed under duress. The lack of drive from sector stakeholders for training and education standards means there is limited availability. There is only a small percentage engaging in training and education, largely because on the one hand one does not need to be qualified to progress and, on the other hand, direct entry is possible without having to prove competence in its purest of definitions. In some regions undergraduate and postgraduate security risk management education does not exist.

Training and education underpin both professionalism and what it is to be a professional. The sector wants to professionalise, yet it does not invest in training and education or make a model available that allows new entrants and those employed to acquire the competence they need to develop and progress. This means that the contract sector is not an attractive career path option and does not encourage people to join or stay. A workforce that is not competent may be placing those they are charged with protecting at risk in an ever-
evolving, globally interconnected, politically and economically volatile world that is under constant threat from traditional and emerging threats.
Chapter 5 - Developing Career Paths: What do we need?

Introduction
This chapter outlines the findings from stage two: what does the sector need to devise the foundations of a structured career path? The chapter begins by identifying the need for security to be seen as its own management discipline. Next, the need to pay attention to the leaders within the sector and attract career driven individuals is highlighted. Creating occupational boundary within private security is then identified. This is followed by outlining the need for defined roles and responsibilities, a sector competence model and a qualifications framework. Engagement in LLL is identified as a key requirement, and this is then discussed. The chapter then highlights the need for security to be recognised as a profession, and the need for stakeholder buy-in is determined as one of the key drivers of change. Other career path models suitable for adoption are then outlined before the chapter closes with a discussion.

Security Needs to be its Own Management Discipline
As earlier highlighted, Barauch (2004) likens career paths to mountains. The employee is represented as the climber who needs clear direction and guidance on how to climb the mountain and achieve its summit - the summit in the case of security recognized as the post of CSO or indeed one within academia. Employees should be able to see the summit, aspire to reach it and be able to work towards it, and this needs to be supported by progression structures. All interviewees reported that employees must be able to see the summit and those looking on from the outside who may be considering the climb also need to be able to see it. Defining security as its own management discipline is one of the fundamental needs that emerged from participant interviews. They indicated that this is one of the key aspects to devising manned guarding career paths, as expressed by Irish and British interviewees:

“Security needs to be seen as its own management discipline, and if it becomes its own management function and shows how it adds value it sets the scene for a career path structure from the top down.” (1-01)

“There are a number of business management disciplines such as HR and finance for example, these are recognised and accepted widely as management disciplines, and if you want to become either of these there is a pathway, security is no
different, it is also a management discipline but the difference is it is not recognized or accepted as one and it is not being championed. What is needed is recognition and acceptance that security is its own management discipline and a drive towards promoting it among those who are in positions to influence.” (1-11)

To create career paths interviewees argued that first the career path summit role needs to be defined. It needs to be first and foremost a management discipline. The career pathways should be created top down that take into consideration the future direction of the security management role, as illustrated by one of the British interviewees:

“Security management must be the responsibility of the CSO and for any change to occur it needs to be anchored in what is happening at the top of the house. This impacts career paths. If you look at what is currently happening cyber will be part of every security manager’s portfolio within the next ten years so the need is to focus on a top down approach rather than a bottom up one.” (1-09)

One of the American interviewees indicated that there is a need for security managers to report to the board on security risk management and influence decision-making. The idea of this is that it would give security management visibility across organizations, be seen as a driver of the business, become a management discipline and, in turn, a viable career option.

Recognition of an occupation as a discipline is a key element of a profession, and defined career pathways are a key element of a discipline (Larson, 1977). A theme that emerged from most interviews is that security needs to be seen as a serious job that attracts the best candidates. Security is not understood outside its field, and within it there are those who do not understand the evolving nature of it as an occupation (Adendorff, 2009). Brooks (2010) suggests that as an academic subject security continues to struggle with what it is and what are its business functions. Briggs and Edwards (2006) argue that it is foremost a business function and security a secondary function. For security to be recognized as a management discipline, most interviewees agreed it first needs to be seen as its own academic subject. Therefore, a body of knowledge needs be created to support this movement, according to Irish and American interviewees:
“Universities need to support security as a management discipline and create the knowledge through scientific research that informs practice and career paths.” (1-01)

“There is too much market research; it is scientific research of security management that is required to progress private security and those who work in it and attract others to it as a career that provides opportunity.” (1-14)

Gilmore and Williams (2007) assert that research is fundamental to professional development and it underpins an occupational discipline. Neal and Morgan (2000) share this view. They observe that a key element of any discipline is developing an ongoing body of knowledge which informs practice of the latest advances and developments in the area. Some interviewees expressed the view that private security needs its own sector specific researchers that don’t come from the criminology field. This would help define the sector and give another high level career path option, as indicated by Canadian and British interviewees:

“All the research gets done by sociologists and criminologists, but there is a need for sector specific researchers in the discipline of security and this would provide [security] guards and others with a career path route to sector specific researcher [job roles] and this provides them with a clear route to doctoral level.” (1-17)

“There is only a few studying private security and there is a growing group of practitioners like in Portsmouth University, but there needs to be more committed to advancing the industry through research.” (1-10)

One the South African interviewees suggested that security management will become a sub-discipline of criminology and criminal justice within academia. Adendorff (2009) argues that security management needs to pull away from the criminology and criminal justice fields of scientific study. There may indeed be merit in his suggestion as private security arguably differs from criminology and criminal justice. Criminology studies why people commit crime and criminal justice belongs to the prevention of crime and restorative justice. Both of these tend to be reactive, whereas private security takes a proactive approach to security management. It adopts a preventive approach and
encompasses a ‘broad’ set of functions that are non-crime related, and it has its focus on prevention of loss at the micro level and risk management at the macro level.

The Sector Needs a New Form of Leadership

Nalla and Wakefield (2014) argue that attention needs to be paid to the quality of management within the sector. This is a view that was shared by most interviewees who suggested the poor quality leadership and management is a result of the myopic management profile of ex-protective force personnel and the lack of professional development undertaken by private security leaders. This was suggested as one of the main reasons why the current cohort of security managers do not operate at board level since they are unfamiliar with general business practice, as indicated by one of the American interviewees:

“The CSO needs to communicate at board level in a language that is understood; the current cohort of law enforcement do not speak [security] in business language.” (1-12)

Interviewees indicated that as security has evolved to a broader risk management function the current crop of leaders do not have the skill-set to respond to this change and provide the leadership that the sector needs to successfully recruit, retain and promote, as illustrated by one of the British interviewees:

“The current crop of security management from protective force backgrounds doesn’t care about operating at board level and [they] are not interested in developing themselves or bringing others in or along so we need a new group that wants to develop themselves and bring others along.” (1-10)

As previously highlighted, Gill et al. (2007) refer to the modern security manager as the entrepreneur. Briggs and Edwards (2006) hold the same view and identify that modern security managers have become responsible for enterprise risk management which is far removed from the traditional loss prevention role. They identify that the business manager is the most likely contender to be successful in this role. However, interviewees indicated that the business manager should not be an accountant or a general business manager only. They assert that they need to be a security general manager who has the generalist business management knowhow that supplements their functionalist security management skills.
Wakefield and Button (2014) suggest that there is a place for the traditionalist security manager that hails from policing and military backgrounds and that they bring skills not found in the private sector. There was a view amongst American interviewees who suggested that these ex-protective force personnel will continue to make up the security manager profile. There is a need to find a way to transition them, as pointed out by one of the American interviewees:

“What we need to develop a transition model for them so they can acquire the skills they need to make the transition successfully”, (1-13)

Other interviewees argued that the traditionalist may indeed be left behind. This is already occurring as previously highlighted. These interviewees suggested that recruiters will change their security manager profile requirements and opt for business managers to whom they can teach security, rather than security managers to whom they need to teach business skills. They further reported that the contract sector needs to align itself to this movement. They observed that the contract sector continues to hire the traditionalists to give itself an air of legitimacy, as one of the British interviewees asserted:

“You find most end up in the vendor sector to give them credibility.” (1-09)

White (2010) highlights that this has been an historic pattern of the contract guarding sector and most interviewees suggested that the sector needs to cease this practice. It is suggested that instead they need to invest in its staff and encourage development opportunities rather than hiring retired police and military for the purpose of optics. Most interviewees felt that if management are invested in and developed as leaders to understand how to effectively lead, they themselves will be able to promote professional development and provide progression opportunity, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“You do what you know and if you have not been developed yourself you know no better, but if the current cohort recognizes the benefits of personal and professional development [then] they can see the positive benefits [and] they will grow and bring others with them and encourage change.” (1-10)
Trompenaars and Hein Coebergh (2014) inform us that positive leadership traits include doing things for the greater good and challenging the status quo. Most interviewees suggested that change needs to be inherent in security personnel if it is to be successful, and contract security providers need to unify and work together for the greater good. They highlighted the need to improve charge-out rates to those who buy security and that they need to begin dictating the service. However, contract security providers remain fearful of losing contracts and perceive that telling the client what to do as ‘rocking the boat’, as indicated by British and Irish interviewees:

“They are afraid to tell the client what is required in case they lose their contract so instead they put up with the status quo.” (1-10)

“They need to stand up for themselves and start telling the client what is required and not the other way round.” (1-01)

Adendorff (2009) discovered that this is linked to market forces. He reports that in the 1980s profit margins were at 20%, however due to contract security providers undercutting each other the profit base fell to 6-8%; with these low profit margins training was the first to go. Further to this, he highlights a link to career paths. He refers to interviewees of his research who worked for large multi-national contract security providers such as G4S in the 1980s that at that time provided structured career paths for their employees. However, once the profit margins dropped so did professional development and career progression structures. Most interviewees argued that if contractors were to receive higher rates for service they would have the ability then to invest in pay and working conditions, as pointed out by the German interviewee:

“The pay and conditions for staff is very poor for security officer and management and [it] needs to be better to attract and keep the best people and clients need to pay more.” (1-20)

To develop contract security sector staff and create progression opportunities, interviewees asserted that fresh leadership needs to promote professional development and career advancement, recognize talent, bring young people through, bring down the average age and attract graduates. Some highlighted the need to promote a gender balance as the sector is heavily male-dominated. One of the British interviewees observed there is a slow change
occurring. They pointed to the current UK Security Institute chair coming from a progressive business background rather than the protective forces. One of the American interviewees reported that there are similar developments within ASIS in the US, and they highlighted that these are leaders who are focused on professional development and career advancement. Additionally, the Italian interviewee reported that:

“Women in security are growing at a steady pace and many [of them] have become leaders in the sector and hold high ranking roles.” (1-22)

One of the British interviewees pointed out that:

“Women in Security” is an initiative that is strongly supported by trade organizations such as ASIS and the Security Institute.” (1-11)

Another British interviewee suggested that the changing profile of the security manager is as a result of the evolving nature of security risk management and a higher caliber of manager required, as supported by the German interviewee:

“Clients are demanding higher qualified people due to the changing nature of security and threats.” (1-20)

Interviewees opined that changing the mindset of leaders and promoting a new form of leadership will be difficult and this will require a culture change, as one of the British interviewees observed:

“Breaking the culture is the real challenge.” (1-09)

One of the Irish interviewees expanded on this and highlighted that sector buy-in is required:

“The sector needs to accept career paths and the elements that go with it such as increased training which comes with a financial cost.” (1-01_)

Wider sector buy-in is required according to all interviewees. They highlighted that the development of career pathways needs to take into account all stakeholders. They observed
that the largest and most influential security sector stakeholders are those who buy security from the contract sector. These are the ones that dictate service levels and pay, according to one of the British interviewees. Other stakeholders identified by interviewees include the sector itself and its employees, the trade unions, the state and the regulator, the national, European and international trade representative bodies, security training organizations and researchers and universities.

The Sector Needs to Create an Occupational Boundary and Professional Closure

Adendorff (2009) indicates that a primary reason why breaking the culture and getting sector buy-in is difficult is a result of the dominance of the ex-protective force personnel who see neither the value in training and education, nor qualifications as an occupational boundary. The knock-on effect is that the entry criteria for management roles remains weak, thus impacting on defining and developing career paths, according to most interviewees. Training and education are key elements of a defined career path in any occupation (Wakefield, 2014). In any recognized discipline Adendorff (2009) reminds us that training and education support occupational boundary, thus creating entry criteria. An overwhelming theme that emerged from all interviews is the need for increased training and education that in turn support the recognition of security management as a discipline of its own. All interviewees indicated that a key need is for one to be qualified in their current or intended role, as illustrated by interviewees from Ireland, New Zealand, and Canada:

“You need to be qualified for your role, regardless of what it is, you don't see doctors and nurses giving medical advice without being qualified, security consultants keep people safe and are giving risk management advice with no qualifications.” (1-01)

“How can anyone work in a job without first having to prove they are capable, they do this by having the qualifications to do the job, [and] this is what all levels of security need, [to] be qualified first, then work or alternately commit to studying to keep your job.” (1-19)

“It doesn't matter what job you do you need proven competence, qualifications are a key element of competence and this is what security management needs to do,
prove they are competent by having a recognized qualification for what they do.” (1-17)

Interviewees suggested that creating occupational boundary would do away with the Peter Principle progression that is historically associated with the sector, stop direct entry from other occupations and raise the calibre of candidate as they would be formally schooled in their role, as expressed by Irish and Spanish interviewees:

“If you are taught in the latest academic ‘thinking’ of your area and proved competent by passing assessments you set a standard for others to follow and with enough people doing this, change slowly occurs.” (1-07)

“You need qualifications for your role and everyone sees you doing it and you get employment because of the fact you are qualified [and] then others do the same and it sets a standard.” (1-21)

Occupational boundary is a main asset of a profession according to Barton et al. (1999). Furthermore, it is one of the defining features of changing occupational culture. For instance, Sonnenstuhl (1996) carried out a sociological study of sandhogs who built New York City’s tunnels and infrastructures in the early 20th century. This was an occupation that attracted immigrants and the low skilled, akin perhaps to entry level security guarding in many regions, as reported in the previous chapter. Many of these sandhogs were known for their heavy drinking. There was a demand for compressed air technicians and the members of the occupation solidified and created occupational boundary that resulted in the exclusion of anyone who was unqualified. This created better pay and working conditions and transformed the occupational drinking culture of sandhogs. Barton et al. (1999) informs us that occupational boundary has been an element of nursing and specialist medical roles for decades that have created professional closure of these occupations. Larson (1977) highlights social workers as another, and there are several other examples in non-healthcare roles, for instance engineers (Meiksins et al., 1996); human resource managers; (Ulfsdotter, 2014); accountants (Edwards, 2011).

To enter any of these fields one must first complete a course of study. Direct entry is not possible without having proven qualifications. Public security forces such as the police and military have also created occupational boundary, as the Italian interviewee reported:
“The police require all its officers to hold a qualification and [they] do not progress without completing exams, and the military is the same.” (1-22)

Ramshaw (2013) indicates that police officers must be qualified for the role they carry out. They are not allowed on the beat, to arrest offenders, investigate crime, or progress to the next rank without training and education in their role or intended role. Gilbert's (2015) doctoral thesis on tackling fraud in UK central government aimed to establish if counter-fraud practitioners have the skills needed to tackle fraud in a continually complex world. He found that they do not. He highlights the need for some form of professionalism through a commonly understood list of counter-fraud competences, a base qualification for all working in the sector and the delivery of accepted training routes. Most interviewees expressed the view that the sector needs to get to the stage where it is clearly recognized that if one wants to work in a particular role there is a recognised specific qualification. Moreover, they asserted the need for higher level education for security management positions. The ISPT (2008) shares this view, indicating that those working at the highest level of security management should be educated to first and Masters degree levels.

Most interviewees suggested that the greater the occupational boundary the more likely that the pay and working conditions are to improve. All interviewees felt that there is a clear need to improve pay and working conditions. They suggested this will help curb evident high turnover and attract the best candidates. However, as already reported, interviewees cited a clear need for a different form of leadership if this is to be achieved, and they argued that there needs to be buy-in from all stakeholders such as employers, employees and those who buy security.

A key element of occupational boundary is being qualified for the job (Larson, 1977) and a key element of being qualified is training and education (Clark, 1997). It is this aspect of training and education that underpins professionalism (Wakefield, 2014). However, as previously highlighted, the attitude towards training and education within the sector is poor, it is not widely embraced or engaged in, and higher level education is not available in some regions. Most interviewees argued that a sea change is needed in the area of training and education, as expressed by Irish and British interviewees:
“The attitude to training needs to change towards one that encourages personal and professional development if the industry has any hope of professionalizing and attracting people to it as a genuine career option.” (1-11)

“It is unfair to expect them [security managers] to engage in higher level education if it is not available but they have to have it if they want to be on par with their peers [in other industry], so there is a real need for undergraduate and postgraduate security management subjects available for direct entry from school and for experienced practitioners.” (1-01)

The Australian interviewee suggested that career pathways work better with development opportunities. It is the engagement in LLL that most interviewees pointed out as a critical need. They highlighted that this is a key element to developing a career within the sector in addition to it being a significant component to a structured career path. LLL was a concept which came to prominence in 1996, known as the year of LLL. It is a concept that many occupations have since embraced and it places a strong emphasis on investing in human capital. Human capital is seen as the most valuable asset to an organization.

Aspin & Chapman (2001) observe that LLL is concerned with promoting skills and competences necessary for developing capabilities and specific performance in work situations. They further note that skills and competences developed through LLL programmes are vital for the performance of workers in their tackling their specific job responsibilities and to how well they can adapt their general and specialist knowledge and competences to new tasks. They suggest that in this vein a more highly educated and skilled workforce will contribute to a more advanced and competitive economy. They also note that LLL is not only concerned with developing knowledge and skills to adequately complete tasks; it is also about personal growth. The most commonly-cited definition of LLL is that of the European Commission: they define it as all learning activity throughout life, with the aim of improving knowledge, skills and competence, within a personal, civic, social and/or employment-related perspective.

In the context in which learning occurs for adults, there are three general sorts according to Beer (2007). He indicates these are: (1) formal education, (2) informal learning and non-formal learning and (3) continuing or further education. Formal education is defined as full-time study within state systems. It occurs within an organized and structured context
that is explicitly designated as learning. Formal learning generally leads to formal recognition such as diplomas and certificates. Formal education includes continuing education. Informal education refers to all those individual and collective learning activities that we do beyond the requirements of any educational institution. It is embedded in planned activities which are not explicitly designated as learning but contain an important learning element. Non-formal learning encompasses what is often described as semi-structured learning, in other words learning which occurs in environments where there is a learning element; an example would be where there are quality management systems and accidental learning which generate from daily life situations, including at the workplace. Four contexts have been distinguished as a frame for LLL according to Colardyn (1999): (1) general initial education; (2) vocational education and training; (3) professional development and (4) personal development. She groups these under formal and informal. She indicates formal education encompasses literacy and numeracy while vocational and higher education and training prepares one for employment. The non-formal aspect encompasses personal and professional development. Table 5.1 summarizes her characterization:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Personal Development</th>
<th>General Initial Education</th>
<th>Vocational Education &amp; Training</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit based</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private &amp; Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**
- Promotion of Democracy
- Equality
- Respect of plurality of values

**What is done best**
- Basic & Foundation Education
- Vocational Education & Training
- Transition to Work
- Work-specific Training
- Management
- Corporate Universities
- Recognition of Competences
- HR Management

**Focus of Learning**
- Democracy
- Illiteracy (adults)
- Enlightenment (young & adults)
- Basic Skills for Young
- Young Adults Training & Retraining for Unemployed
- Retraining of under-qualified employed
- Integration in Enterprise (young)
- Retraining of Adults

**Certification**
- Often non-existent
- Moves Towards Validation/Recognition
- Formal General Qualifications Credit Towards a Formal Qualification
- Formal Vocational Qualifications
- Attendance Certificate
- Certificate of Competences

- Non-formal
- Formal
- Formal
- Non-formal

**Table 5.1: Characterisation for LLL, Colardyn (1999)**

The European Commission published a paper in 2006 identifying the key competences required for LLL. They define competences as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes (KSAs) appropriate to the context. They note key competences that all individuals need for personal fulfillment and development, active, social inclusion and employment. They developed a Reference Framework and identified these key competences for LLL, illustrated in Table 5.2:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Key Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication in Native Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication in Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mathematical Competence and Basic Competences in Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Digital Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learning to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social and Civic Competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sense of Initiative and Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural Awareness and Expression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The European Commission’s eight key competences required for LLL

According to most interviewees there needs to be a way of recognizing prior learning, particularly of those with long time service. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) has been an ongoing problem within the sector, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“There is still a problem with recognizing prior learning, nobody has yet figured out a system which measures what people already know about security and then placing them in the right role relevant to their qualifications so a key requirement is to be able to recognize experience and the learning that goes with that [experience].” (1-02)

Another Irish interviewee expressed the difficulty when evaluating experience within the sector:

“If you take someone with 20 years’ experience in the industry, is it one year’s experience of doing the same thing over and over for 20 years, to me that is not someone having a broad 20 years’ experience of the security industry but a person with a very narrow experience of doing the same thing over and over and if they started off wrong and have not been corrected then their experience would have to be questioned so there is a real need to find a way for assessing this experience.” (1-01)

As Wakefield and Button (2014) point out, there needs to be a set of measured competences. Interviewees indicated that it is not possible to measure these competences as there is no method or defined model for doing so. Some interviewees acknowledged that
there has to be a place for ex-protective force personnel but they suggested that their prior learning must be quantifiable.

Interviewees highlighted the need for fair, transparent and objective hiring practices. One of the American interviewees indicated that objective hiring should be based on the candidate with the best quantifiable blend of skills, experience and qualifications. Indeed this is a very close match to the definition of what it is to be competent in a role. The Oxford Dictionary defines competent as having the necessary ability, knowledge or skill to do something successfully.

For all the perceived negative aspects ex-protective force personnel bring to career pathways and the signal sent by hiring these and promoting them over others, there is an acknowledgement that the sector needs to recognise their value. As earlier highlighted, the sector does little to help them adjust, according to some interviewees. One of the American interviewees asserted that these personnel will continue to settle within private security and that the sector needs to bridge the gap for them to transfer easily. This interviewee suggested developing a bespoke introductory qualification aimed at providing them with the knowledge and skills they need to then acquire the skills they do not have.

As previously highlighted there is a Peter Principle approach to promoting both non-protective and ex-protective force practitioners. Those non-protective force personnel have gained valuable experience within the sector through non-formal learning. The OECD indicates that learning which takes place outside of education institutions is a rich source of human capital. This is particularly relevant amongst security practitioners. In security management positions there are practitioners working with several years’ operational and business experience without any qualification. Most interviewees highlighted the need to find a measurable way to recognise their prior learning gained in these roles. Adendorff (2009) makes the point that ex-protective force security managers have experience. But as one of the Irish interviewees argued, it may be a narrow experience:

“Most security officers and managers have years of experience, but experience of what, the industry is so diverse they can’t be experienced in all areas of industry and I bet if you test their experience you will find their experience does not give them the expertise they purport to have.” (1-01)
Most interviewees placed value on quantifiable experience and professional certifications as well as academic qualifications, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“I would value experience more than qualifications but the experience must be quantifiable which at the moment it is not and there also needs to be recognition of prior learning and a method for testing it which would begin to put everyone on a level playing field when applying for work. Professional qualifications such as the CPP is an example of a qualification which people should have as well as experience but to get to the senior head of roles you must have postgraduate qualifications in the discipline.” (1-04)

There is a growing number of postgraduate security management programmes available throughout the world, and to a lesser degree, undergraduate programmes. However, as earlier indicated there are some regions where there are none. Most postgraduate programmes allow direct entry without an undergraduate degree based on the applicant’s prior experience. Two of the Irish interviewees indicated the need to review this direct entry model:

“What happens is you complete a vocational level security management qualification, for example, in Ireland we have the Diploma in Security Management. This is at vocational level six, and a Masters is at level nine on our qualification framework and there is an expectation that they can step up from this lower level to near the highest level. This would need to be reviewed in my opinion.” (1-08)

“It is a big jump, what you are doing is removing some of the rungs on the ladder and setting them up to fail. This needs to be looked at, if you want to get a Masters you should be able to prove you are able to go through the progressive levels first.” (1-01)

All interviewees argued that there is a need for higher level security management education. They expressed a view that a security manager needing to hold an undergraduate or postgraduate security management qualification for their job would begin to define security as a management and academic discipline. This may provide the career path mountain summit that Barauch (2004) refers to, and somewhere for those within and
outside the sector to aspire to, according to one of the British interviewees. One of the Irish interviewees argued that if all security managers require higher level education it raises the status of security as a career, creates occupational boundary, raises the level of expertise, puts everyone on par with each other and with their peers in other industry and creates a standard. All interviewees agreed that this would support the professionalism of the sector. They opined that continuing one’s professional development is identified as an element of a structured career path a key feature of LLL. Typical definitions of CPD include individuals broadening their skills in addition to updating them and the development of personal qualities necessary for the execution of professional and technical duties through their working life (Day, 1994).

Some interviewees suggested that CPD enables individuals to demonstrate best practice and commitment to their profession. One of the key elements of CPD is that it needs to be systematic (Day, 1994). CPD should provide information and training on topical issues within the sector, specialist areas, business skills, legislative updates, and other developments affecting private security, according to some interviewees. They argued that practitioners need to evidence a real commitment to their occupation and they suggested maintaining membership of a recognized association as a CPD requirement.

There are examples of this already, two notable being ASIS and the UK Security Institute. To maintain the ASIS CPP status practitioners must commit to CPD, and if they don’t they lose their credentials. The CPP is widely recognized within the US amongst practitioners, employers and those who buy security, according to most interviewees. There are several examples of security management and consultancy job vacancies that require the applicant to hold CPP status. Not having CPP status or maintaining it could therefore impact on one’s career.

The UK Security Institute recently achieved Chartered status, and they can now grant suitably qualified practitioners Chartered member status that can use the post nominal CSyP (Chartered Security Professional). One of the British interviewees considered that within the next ten years Chartered status will be akin to the recognition CPP has within the US. Chartered status is bestowed only on those who can provide evidence of significant competence and commitment to their occupation, according to Adendorff (2009).

Adendorff (2009) informs us that an occupation afforded Chartered status is seen to be taken more seriously by society, and it is symbolic with recognition of a profession. He observes a link among professions, status and perception. Neal and Morgan (2000) remind
us that the traditional professions include medicine and law. Those who belong to these professions are bestowed high status by society and are seen to be of particular high standing due to their education, high ethical standards and the strict entry criterion one must overcome. The effect is that the professions attract the best candidates. Additionally, for them to continue working they must up-skill and refresh their skills through CPD requirements. Adendorff (2009) observes that a modern version of the traditional profession includes those occupations with Chartered status.

There are several examples of current day occupations that have achieved Chartered status. These include accountants; engineers; health and safety practitioners and human resource managers. These all share a common theme of prerequisites. Prerequisites include proven experience and qualifications set by their own sector (Neal and Morgan, 2000). A further theme is the dual role statutory and sector-specific self-regulation that is evident in some occupations. These elements can be seen in Neal and Morgan’s Table 5.3 below, adapted to include security management and guarding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Discipline</th>
<th>Professional Association</th>
<th>Entry Exams</th>
<th>Chartered Status</th>
<th>Recognized Academic Discipline</th>
<th>CPD Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioner</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Engineer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Manager</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety Practitioner</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Guarding</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.3: The elements of Chartered status occupations, adapted and based on Neal and Morgan (2000)*
The prerequisites to taking up a role within the sector emerged from interviewees. These were identified as the need to be suitability qualified, to be committed to CPD, and to obtain police clearance before taking up employment. Some interviewees suggested that having recognized, agreed prerequisites provides clear and transparent career path guidance.

From Neal and Morgan's adapted table above, it is evident that security cannot yet be classified as a profession. A common theme that emerged from participant interviews is the need for security to be seen as a profession, as illustrated by the Italian interviewee:

“If you want to create security careers it needs to become a profession like traditional occupations and this will mean everyone must be qualified and show commitment to succeeding.” (1-22)

Interviewees said that the sector being seen as a profession would be the pinnacle for it to attract high caliber candidates. Image, status and career paths are strongly linked to an occupation recognized as a profession and those within it professional, according to Hargreaves (2006). People employed in medicine and law are viewed amongst society as parts of a profession. This is due to the status and image bestowed on the occupation by society. This is a key element that defines a discipline as a profession (Hargreaves, 2006).

However, the security sector has a negative image and it is bestowed little status, according to most interviewees. Therefore, security cannot be considered to be a profession or those within it as professional (Adendorff, 2009). The result of such negative perception is that security does not sell itself as an attractive career option as it does not bestow status. Interviewees suggested that if security was to be realized as a management discipline and as a profession it would be an attractive viable career option. And as a business management function it would add value to the organisations that it serves. Security guards may recognize this and realise that opportunity exists for progression.

A debate on whether security is or is not a profession has been ongoing for several decades amongst Simonson (1996); Manunta (1996); Adendorff (2009); Brooks (2010) and Wakefield and Button (2014). Simonsen (1996) identified five elements that must exist for an occupation to be regarded as a profession. He outlined these as defined standards and ethical codes, an established knowledge/ base, recognized associations, measurable competences along with appropriate certification programmes and an educational discipline. He concluded that the latter existed within private security and claimed that the
sector could be identified as a profession; it is demonstrably advancing its people to the top of the house and providing opportunities. However, Adendorff (2009) and Wakefield and Button (2014) more recently conclude that the sector does not yet have all these elements. This study supports their conclusion. Therefore, the sector cannot be recognized as a profession, and while some elements do exist, other elements are missing and there is no structured and coherent approach. One of the British interviewees suggested that:

“The sector needs to become a profession and have all the elements of one if a career path is going to be developed. It will need qualified professionals and there also needs to be an organization who acts as the main body for professional development and championing security as a career.” (1-11)

**What Other Career Path Models are Suitable for Adoption?**

Interviewees were asked to identify other career path models that may be suitable for adoption. They identified the progression model based on ranks of the police and the service sectors of facilities management (FM), retail and construction. The police are a government-sponsored occupation in the public interest, whereas FM, retail and construction are private sector service-oriented occupations with profit making embedded in its values. Nonetheless, while their values and purpose may differ, they all have a common theme of progression based on competence with training and education seen as a means to increasing productivity and developing career paths. An overview of the police, FM, retail and construction is presented in turn below.

**The Police**

Some interviewees pointed to the ranking structure within the police. They suggested that there are clear progression routes mapped out in these occupations, as one of the Irish interviewees noted:

“There is a clear ranking system and you can progress both sideways and upward in the police and military and you have the option of technical or managerial roles but before you progress you must undergo training relevant to the role.” (1-03)

Within the American police an officer is typically promoted through the ranks of sergeant and lieutenant before attaining the managerial rank of captain, according to Polk and Armstrong (2001). They highlight that training and education is a fundamental aspect
toward promotion. Referring to the Irish police, the ranks in descending order are seen at Table 5.4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garda Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.4: An Garda Síochána Ranking Structure*

Irish police adopts a centralized policing model. This means it is governed by one person, the Commissioner, who has Deputy and Assistant Commissioners. From here, the structure is divided into six regions under the responsibility of a Chief Superintendent. Each Division is sub-divided into Districts with a Superintendent in charge. There are 28 Divisions and 96 Districts in the State and each district is the responsibility of a Sergeant. The model of policing and its career pathways is heavily influenced by its organizational structures. Centralized ones like that of the Irish offer less hierarchy movement, whereas, decentralized ones as seen in other countries offer more opportunity (Kelling and Moore, 1988).

Polk and Armstrong (2001) highlight that officers can be assigned to specialist duties. In police forces throughout the world there are specialist career path routes available in a variety of fields. These include Community Policing, Traffic Control and regulation, Public Order, Detective Duties, Investigating Organised Crime, Fraud and Drugs Offences. Reiner (1991) observes Anglo-Saxon police promotional systems from the frontline requires the prospective employee to have spent some time as a police officer as a precondition to middle management. New members of the service spend some years on normal uniformed policing duties first, and after that they can apply for specialist area vacancies; each section will have its own unique selection procedures. (Kelling and Moore, 1988; Polk and Armstrong, 2001; Reiner, 1991; Buker, 2010)
Not all police officers or security guards will want to progress and some are happy just to turn up and do their job, as opined by one of the British interviewees:

“They won't all want to progress some are happy just to come in, pick up their pay and go home, they are not career driven, but that's okay, but for the ones who are we have to find away to motivate them and give them options or they will just leave or become disillusioned.” (1-10)

Akin to the police, not all private security organizations will have the hierarchy structures to allow upward movement, according to Canadian and New Zealand interviewees. Another option that has become prevalent is the qualified and ambitious security practitioners making their own career path to self-employed security risk management consulting roles. This is a result of how organizations have de-layered and become more flat, resulting in less promotional opportunities and protean career path structures (Reitman and Schneer, 2005). Protean career paths are very much self-directed and have resulted in the spike of contractor consultants who manage their own career paths (Heslin, 2005). Some interviewees highlighted the opportunity this has created for independent self-employed security risk management consultants, as illustrated by one of the Irish consultants:

“There is opportunity for consultancy work in areas like investigations management, expert witness, security surveys and risk assessments, developing security risk management systems, information security and the cyber threat and training and development, generally they get hired in and work on projects and move on to the next client when done.” (1-05)

However, interviewees considered that police officers and security personnel do depend on their employer to provide them with progression and show them the way and they expect this. The suggested that most police officers and security personnel would struggle to make their own pathway. McDonald (2004) reminds us that there are a number of employees that still rely on the traditional career path created by their employing organization. This is particularly prevalent in policing, according to Ramshaw (2013). She refers to UK policing and indicates that constables have been given various incentives put forward by Lord Scarman (1981); these include a competence-related threshold scheme and special priority payments for front-line posts of high responsibility that have high demanding working
conditions or are difficult posts to fill or retain. These rewards are seen as an alternative to promotion where moving up the ladder is not possible. In an aim to provide other alternatives, sideward career movement was introduced in the mid-noughties to community policy roles, allowing movement within departments (Ramshaw, 2013).

Buker and Dolu (2010) studied police job satisfaction of the Turkish National Police Force (TNPF) and found that the performance of police organizations is strongly related to their employees’ level of satisfaction and to the skills of police leaders and managers. Buker (2010) suggests that job satisfaction is strongly linked to poor occupational culture. He argues that modern management techniques and a transformational leadership model at the micro-level can create a positive work environment which would improve the officers’ level of satisfaction.

However, akin to the private security sector there remains the fundamental issue of pay affecting the recruitment and retention of police officers and caused by its occupational culture. Heslin (2005) identifies objective outcomes as adequate proxies for career success, the most commonly cited of these being pay and promotion.

As earlier indicated, spending time at frontline policing is the norm in Anglo-Saxon police forces. Bruker (2010) reminds us that this is not the model evident in all countries. He uses the example of Turkey where direct entry to middle-management without frontline experience occurs, referring to this as a two-track promotion system. He observes that this may cause dissatisfaction amongst police officers and that promotion is more difficult as this restricts the opportunity for traditional promotion. Bruker (2010) suggests an appreciable dependence by frontline officers on lateral progression to further their careers. As a result of the traditional reward of promotion of status being removed a greater reliance is then placed on initiatives to ensure job satisfaction. Some interviewees asserted the importance of creating private security career-path lattices and other forms of incentives to assist with retention and job satisfaction for those who work in organizations where promotion is not possible due to their structure or indeed for those who are not interested in promotion.

As previously highlighted, the police service suffers from poor leadership and management. Peter Neyroud’s review of UK policing in 2011 placed a heavy emphasis on leadership skills and training aimed at professionalising the police. Sklanksy (2013)
reminds us that this professionalism agenda is underpinned by standards of competence to do the job. He identifies police professionalism as four different ideas: *high expectations*, where police are held to demanding standards of conduct; *self-regulating*, that the police should be answerable to themselves, akin, to the medical and legal professions; *expertise*, that doing policing should be built on a knowledge base and that it is reflective; and *internalized norms*, where their actions are guided by internal norms rather than imposed on them by a bureaucratic command structure.

Fleming (2013) informs us from an international perspective that standards, training and education have come to be associated with a move toward police professionalism. Considering Australian policing, Lanyon (2009) observes that their professionalism model for change in the early noughties was based on the police completing university-based education and on-going development of competences. Green and Woolston (2014) observe that the Australian police partners with the Charles Stuart University to develop and deliver police training and education and recruitment involves successful completion of an associate degree program.

Berlin (2014) informs us that American police training and education differs from state to state due to their decentralised policing model and the political nature of it; however, they note that 45 percent of police education is operated by higher education academic institutions. She further observes that the design and delivery of entrance level training is, in fact, far more sophisticated than is generally known and is highly regulated; recent developments include problem based learning and use of online resources to supplement classroom instruction. Wyatt and Bell (2014) observe the Canadian police training and education model is academic based and there is a recent development in online learning and competency for police personnel.

Stanislas (2014) cautions that there is no great body of research to support the view that higher education is producing better police systems, however, he does acknowledge that in its absence the there is promising pieces of evidence slowly emerging of the personal and other benefits derived by police officers from higher education in various roles and capacities. Indeed, arguably training and education have for many years been seen as necessary for the success of police professionalism, traceable back to both Volmer and Edgar Hoover’s transformation of American law enforcement in the early 20th Century.
The UK police have recently set about transforming their staff and up-skilling them for the future. In their 2016 consultation paper the College of Policing (CoP) outlines a proposal to introduce a Policing Education Qualifications Framework (PEQF). This is proposed as a standardized national framework that sets minimum education qualification levels by level of practice or rank. This followed as a result of their previous analysis of demand on police services that they published in 2015. Highlighted were changing patterns of crime and public protection, and the investigation and prevention of crime becoming more complex and taking an increasing amount of police time. The CoP’s Leadership Review identified that their aim is to develop their officers to higher education standard through a qualifications framework and recognition of prior learning. Towards the end of 2016 the CoP is introducing a CPD framework for everyone who works in policing, beginning with new recruits and chief officers, including an emphasis on the knowledge and skills needed to use, understand and build the profession’s research evidence base.

Byrant et al. (2013) argue that higher education can, and does, play a key role in enhancing the professionalism and professional status of policing. They refer to the police officer as the ‘excluded middle’ who until now has received little attention of their development needs, and contend that current training and education of police officers fall short of what is required. Byrant et al. (2013) consider that society needs police officers that are equipped to make sound professional decisions and empowered to be problem solvers with discretionary decision-making responsibility. According to them, academic qualities are required for a person to be able to demonstrate that they have the appropriate knowledge and attributes to be a police officer. Notably, without academic qualifications, they observe that parents from some ethnic backgrounds discourage their children from joining the police because it is seen to lack professional credentials when compared, for example, to law or medicine. They offer that it is reasonable to suggest that academic qualifications are required to enhance the professional status of policing and attract the best candidates to it as a viable career option.

Facilities Management

Facilities management is a service industry that provides support services. It is represented by a professional body, the British Institute of Facilities Management (BIFM). In their Get Ahead publication, their Director of Education indicates that qualifications are essential to gaining respect, recognition, and securing one’s future, and that the knowledge, skills and experience gained from these are essential to organizational performance. Their FM
professional standards define the competences needed to be effective in an FM role at each career stage. They support new entrants and those already employed through their FM development pathway that provides a road map and identifies the career level and qualifications. Additionally, they provide their members with free and discounted resources, a CPD tool and access to free events and networking opportunities and training.

FM Career Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Supervisory</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Administrator</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Contract Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Manager; Premises</td>
<td>Area Facility Manager; Area Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Coordinator</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td>Contract Manager; Contract Manager; Account Manager</td>
<td>Area Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner Coordinator</td>
<td>Cleaner Administrator</td>
<td>Account Manager</td>
<td>Head of FM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Coordinator</td>
<td>Security Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications Level (L)</th>
<th>L2 Qualifications in Facilities Services</th>
<th>L4 Qualifications in Facilities Management</th>
<th>L6 Qualifications in Facilities Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L3 Qualifications in FM</td>
<td>L5 Qualifications in FM</td>
<td>L7 Qualifications in FM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apprenticeship</th>
<th>Apprenticeship in FM</th>
<th>Higher Level Apprenticeships in FM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Grade</td>
<td>Affiliate Associate</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: FM Career Level, (BIFM)
BIFM qualifications are available at Levels 2 to 7 and provide options to school leavers or those who want to study to Masters Degree Level; they provide an example of this, seen in table 5.5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIFM Level</th>
<th>Who is it for?</th>
<th>Qualification Level Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L 7 in FM</td>
<td>Strategic Head of Facilities</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 6 in FM</td>
<td>Senior Strategic Facilities Managers</td>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 5 in FM</td>
<td>Specialist Facilities Managers</td>
<td>Foundation Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 4 in FM</td>
<td>Operational Facilities Managers</td>
<td>Certificate of HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 3 in FM</td>
<td>First-line and Supervisory Managers</td>
<td>A Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 2 in FS</td>
<td>New Entrants</td>
<td>GCSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Apprentices are available from Levels 2 to 5

Table 5.5: BIFM Qualifications supporting career development (example for guidance purposes)

BIFM report that both individual and corporate members have the above frameworks at operational, management and strategic levels to assist them develop their career. The BIFM What’s in it for the employee? is seen at Table 5.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>What’s in it for the employee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enable career progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrate commitment to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Build capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Build earning potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Achieve national and internationally recognized FM qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improve confidence and enhance credibility in the workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acquire knowledge and skills that are aligned to FM professional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Influence organizational strategic decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Add value to client relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: BIFM What’s in it for the employee?
FM has a security aspect to it at the frontline guarding support services level. However, as earlier highlighted, integrating security into facilities is not considered a good idea as the security career pathway has a different summit. One of the Irish interviewees indicates that:

“If at corporate security management, CSO or the CISO, we look to integrate the physical and the cyber, and this is the position aspired to, then security has no place in facilities management as the top positions are not security risk management focused, but saying that, at the lower frontline new entrant level there is no great harm with it in FM but there needs to be a security industry model the security officer can latch on to so they can get on the correct or alternative pathway.” (1-03)

If a sector specific security competency model was to be developed, perhaps frontline security personnel would then have two career path options, one in FM and one in security, as illustrated by an Irish interviewee:

“What harm would it do, do you not think it would be great to have two career path options, one to facilities and one to security management.” (1-01)

**Retail**

Some interviewees suggested looking at the retail sector as a model for consideration. One of the Irish interviewees who has a background in retail management indicated there is a career progression model within retail that provides new entrants and existing employees with promotion opportunities:

“You can start off on the floor or tills and progress through sponsored trainee manager programmes; Lidl’s graduate programme is a great example of this and they pay very well, there are supervisor roles, trainee manager, assistant manager and store manager roles as well as department managers like grocery or health and beauty and for management roles they require you to have a qualification. (1-08)

In 2007 the National Retail Federations (NRF) Foundation in the US developed Competency Statements for Retail Management with support from the US Department of Labor and American Express Foundation. They hold that this credential defines a new level of career advancement to motivate retail leaders to stay and grow in their jobs. The
certification was designed to capture the core of what Retail Managers need to know for a broad range of management and supervisory positions. As such, it is appropriate for anyone wanting to pursue a management career long-term in retail and related industries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Administrative and Financial Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Merchandising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Selling and Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.7: Retail management competency statements*

The above competences have been determined as describing work in a best-practice high-performance organization at the level of a Retail Manager with 3-5 years’ experience. The NRF aims to use these to shape the future of retail by developing talent through education, experiences and scholarships; and fostering career growth among people who work in retail. Their competency statements on the one hand help employees to measure, document and showcase their skills, and on the other hand provide the fundamental KSAs that current and prospective employers need to demonstrate success in related trades and careers.

In the US in 2015 the Western Association of Food Chains (WAFC) built on the above earlier work and aligned a certificate program with retail competences with the aim of affording frontline retail employees opportunities to move along a career pathway into meaningful management occupations offering family-sustaining wages. The Director of the Retail Management Certificate programme, Cherie Phipps (2015:3), articulates that the retail management certificate is the ticket to the front of the line for hiring and promotion and that the objective is to help people accelerate their education toward a viable career path. She states that it’s a win-win proposition; students can earn college credit and embark on a career pathway to a fulfilling career in the retail sector and employers can benefit by finding qualified employees trained in the competences that they have stipulated as requirements for the role.
Construction

The construction sector was once seen as a job for the low skilled and having limited entry criterion. However, this has changed over the past two decades and today, if one wants to work in the construction sector, you need to be qualified and engage in CPD. Two of the Irish interviewees commented:

“The construction model is one you should consider looking at closely, in many ways the construction industry profile is similar to security but the difference is they are qualified in construction and have a defined career pathway based on qualifications and you can’t get a job in construction anymore like you once could, it’s really tightened up.” (1-06)

“You have the entry level jobs and labourers but you don’t get these without being qualified, you can’t pick up a shovel now in construction without a qualification and if you look at the management roles the foreman is qualified to third level and you have site management and project managers and engineers and health and safety officers, everyone of these is highly qualified to degree level and must engage in CPD.” (1-08)

The UK construction trade went through a professionalism transformation in the late 1990s. At the heart of this professionalism transformation were people and investment in them. Construction had been suffering from under-achievement, low profits, limited investment in human capital and no research and development and training, according to Egan (1998). The 1998 Egan report, *Rethinking Construction*, found that the construction sector had a low and unreliable rate of profitability with margins characteristically very low to sustain healthy development. Too many clients were undiscriminating and equating price with cost, selecting designers and those from the construction industry almost exclusively on the basis of tendered price. This tendency was widely seen as one of the greatest barriers to improvement, akin to what some of the interviewees of this study say is happening within the manned guarding sector. Egan (1998) highlighted a crisis in training and concern about skill shortages with too few people trained to replace an ageing skilled workforce; too few were acquiring the technical and managerial skills required to get full value from new techniques and technologies. These people found that construction lacked a proper career structure to develop supervisory and management grades. Additionally, it was highlighted that the sector was unable to recruit and retain and suffered from high turnover, poor image, and was an unattractive unsafe sector to be employed in with poor pay and working conditions.
Egan (1998) asserted that construction must be an industry whose workforce is properly valued, who are able to work in healthy and safe conditions, who are appropriately skilled and qualified and developed through a systematic programme of continuing personal and professional development. In the years that followed, through subsequent taskforces and forums the construction trade has transformed into one that provides a genuine career and a pathway, and caters for diversity. Today there are career path opportunities from entry level through to management positions and specialised roles that are attractive career options, that pay well and that provide opportunity for further development. Progression within construction is based on being able to do the job, and is underpinned by training and education.

Discussion
Key themes emerging outlined what the sector needs to develop the foundations of a structured career pathway. First, security needs to be acknowledged as a management discipline in academia and within organisations as part of the overall organizational strategy. Security management needs to challenge other business occupations with security managers operating at the same professional status level as their peers and the CSO representative at board level. It is the CSO’s role that is the career path summit; therefore, the career path route needs to reach this destination. A new form of security manager is needed, one that is schooled in corporate security risk management rather than traditional security manager skills associated with ‘locks and bolts’ security solutions. This new form of leadership would aim to provide the direction for others to follow with a heavy emphasis on professional development as a means of succeeding. Challenging those who buy security and the general training and education status quo, developing young people, creating roles for security management graduates and encouraging more women into the sector are also seen as part of the professionalism project.

Occupational boundary and professional closure was highlighted as a key need. Occupational boundary means that if one wants to work in a security role then one must hold a qualification for their job function. This would create a certain professional closure and raise the status of security as an occupation, thus raising the perception of security and attracting the best candidates and providing existing employees with development opportunities. Security would no longer be seen as a low entry criteria occupation in which almost anyone can work, and it may curb the stop gap mindset and high turnover of security personnel. Furthermore, it would challenge the traditional security practitioner profile.
Key to occupational boundary is not only engagement in LLL but also one’s inherent drive towards ongoing personal and professional development. Both undergraduate education and postgraduate higher education are seen as key needs. They need to be available, accessible and consistent in their programme content. Transparency in how people get hired to security management positions emerged as a key need – there needs to be objective hiring practices based on the best balance of experience, skills and qualifications.

The ultimate need that emerged was the aspect of security as an occupation seen as a profession. Modern day professions are best described as those that have Chartered status bestowed on them. Indeed, security management does carry Chartered status and is available through the UK Security Institute. However, as a sector security remains short in two areas: it is not widely recognized as an academic discipline, and there is no mandatory CPD.

Other career path models were identified. These were the ranking structure of the police, and the service sectors of FM, retail and construction. The common thread running through these is the need for job holders to be qualified and training and education to underpin professional standards. Training and education underpin professionalism. Holtman (2011) stresses that professionalism is at the heart of risk management and professional values emphasize shared values based on competences developed through training and education (Evets, 2011). Friedson (2001) identifies the importance of maintaining professionalism as the main principle of expert services.

Evident from this study is the need for those fulfilling security risk management roles to be capable of managing risk at all levels, be qualified for their job and to engage in lifelong learning not only as a means of progression but also toward remaining up-to-date and current in their role. To create a career pathway to the discipline of security management there needs to be a professionalism project that is supported by what McDonald (2004) refers to as professional demarcation. The general consensus is that the sector needs to adopt other professionalism initiatives, allowing a platform upon which can be built the foundations of a career path. The foundations of a career path support the professionalism of the sector, while the professionalism of the sector supports career paths; therefore, both need each other if both are to succeed.
Chapter 6 - Career Paths: How do we get there?

Introduction
This chapter discusses how the sector should go about developing the foundations of a structured career path. It begins by discussing how a competency model and a qualifications framework would shape the progression route, address RRL, and provide a transparent model of hiring security personnel whilst also considering the informal learning of experienced practitioners. Sector stakeholders in the US, Australia and the UK have recently carried out bodies of work in this area, and these will be considered. Collaboration and research is then discussed with sector stakeholder buy-in seen as a driver of change. The chapter then ends with a discussion of the main themes.

Developing a Competency Model
Most interviewees argued that developing a competency model and a qualifications framework would act as the foundations of a structured career path as illustrated by Irish, British and American interviewees:

“Developing a competency model aligned to a suite of qualifications is the way to create progression routes that make a career path.” (1-03)

“We have to develop a sector qualification framework to support a competency model.” (1-10)

“Qualifications need to be defined appropriate to every role being carried out and these aligned to the national framework of qualifications so they are clearly recognizable and relevant to the job function.” (1-13)

Additionally, a competency model and qualifications framework is deemed to be a key component of professionalizing the sector, as illustrated by the Italian interviewee:

“We have to make security a profession; we need to have competences recognized and qualifications for them.” (1-22)

Internationally, advances are being made with competency model development. For instance, in the US, ASIS in collaboration with the University of Phoenix and the Apollo Group have developed an operational security sector competency model. They indicate that
their model is not intended to be a definitive list of all operational security knowledge, skills, and abilities. Instead, it is intended as a resource for further exploration of the competences needed for the sector. They utilized the US Department of Labor Competency Model Clearinghouse *Build a Model Tool* to create their model, as seen in Figure 6.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management-Competencies</th>
<th>Occupation-Specific Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation-Specific Management Competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industry-Sector Functional Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss Prevention</th>
<th>Bank &amp; Finance</th>
<th>Engineering &amp; Design</th>
<th>Government Services</th>
<th>Hospital &amp; Entertainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Service, Sales, Equipment</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industry-Wide Technical Competencies**

|-----------------|---------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------|

**Workplace Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teamwork</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Organising</th>
<th>Innovative &amp; Strategic Thinking</th>
<th>Problem Solving &amp; Decision Making</th>
<th>Working with Tools &amp; Technology</th>
<th>Business Acumen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Academic Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Fundamentals</th>
<th>Business Foundations</th>
<th>Critical &amp; Analytical Thinking</th>
<th>STEM Literacy</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Writing</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Personal Effectiveness Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Skills &amp; Teamwork</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Adaptability-Flexibility</th>
<th>Dependibility-Reliability</th>
<th>Lifelong Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Figure 6.1: ASIS Operational Security Industry Competency Model*

ASIS (2015) suggest acquiring generalist skills first before deciding on a specialist functionalist role. Indeed, this is what Adendorff (2009) suggests as the best way forward. One of the American interviewees agreed; they suggested that this approach would create a level playing field as it would allow for objective hiring since everyone would be at the same competence level. Therefore, it would provide an opportunity to all candidates regardless of their previous backgrounds, and put business skills before functionalist skills.
They explained that from here practitioners could develop the security functional competences.

The previously mentioned KOMSI project defined entry level security guarding competences. This pan-European group focused on the common competences at entry level security guarding throughout Europe, and considered the mobility of security officer qualifications between member states. They developed five common competences which they mapped to Level 3 on the European Qualification Framework (EQF), as shown in Table 6.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSI</th>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Emergencies</th>
<th>Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Industry</td>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>Housekeeping Principles</td>
<td>Define Emergencies</td>
<td>Communication Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Role</td>
<td>Civil Law</td>
<td>Patrolling Procedures</td>
<td>Immediate Action</td>
<td>Body Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in Society</td>
<td>Employment Law</td>
<td>Access and Egress</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>Verbal Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Security</td>
<td>Safety Law</td>
<td>Electronic Aids</td>
<td>Emergency Equipment</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Officer</td>
<td>Equality Law</td>
<td>Hardware Products</td>
<td>Responding to an Alert</td>
<td>Compiling Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Prevention</td>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>Non-emergency Issues</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Communication Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>Environmental Law</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Scene Preservation</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Structure</td>
<td>Special Administrative Law</td>
<td>Safety and Fire Equipment</td>
<td>Emergency Evacuation</td>
<td>Observation Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management</td>
<td>PSI Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self Defence Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Court Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffusing Aggression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: KOMSI Project Common Competences for Entry Level Security Guarding

The above common competences set by referencing the action verbs at level 3 on the EQF highlight what an entry level security officer should understand and be able to do, describing their learning outcomes. Each of the five competences - PSI (private security
industry), law, procedures, procedures and emergencies – is its own separate unit. When all units are combined they form one complete security guarding module.

**Defining the Roles & Developing a Qualifications Framework**

All interviewees agreed that security roles needed to be clearly defined, as Irish and British interviewees explained:

“‘You need to know what the roles are [and] what they do and what level they do it at, so you will need to define these and take into consideration what the role [is that] everyone can aim for [career path summit role] and work back.” (1-08)

“‘To define the security roles is key, and creating clear job titles [is what] you need to do so you can match them to the relevant competence and qualification needed for that role.” (1-10)

Richard Diston of the Security Institute (UK) makes the point in a City Security Magazine article from September 2016 that there is a need for clarity in respect of the longer-term opportunities that are available to practitioners. In the UK, ‘Skills for Security’ has begun developing a hierarchy progression structure from entry level through to management. They identify the roles, inclusive of specialisms, and suggest the qualifications relevant to these roles. Their contract sector security guarding career pathway is seen in Figure 6.2:
According to most interviewees, aligning a suite of qualifications to support the security competency model is the next step. They argued that this will create a level playing field and facilitate transparent hiring and progression based on commonly recognised sector competences. In Australia, the ISTP (2008) developed a model that defines strategic, tactical and operational roles. It advocates that role-based standards frameworks are based on the roles and responsibilities of security professionals. How they are categorized into strategic, operational or tactical responsibilities across a number of security job requirements can be seen in Table 6.2.

Figure 6.2: Security Guarding Career Pathway, Skills for Security, (2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Interfaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning &amp; Security Management Systems Performance Agreements Stakeholders</td>
<td>Standards Setting</td>
<td>Approval &amp; Resourcing Training Plan Briefings to Supervisors Delivery of Strategic &amp; Specialist Training</td>
<td>Division Heads &amp; C-Suite Senior External Groups Suppliers &amp; Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Assessment of Systems Rostering Analysis of activities Oversight day to day operations Liaison at local level</td>
<td>Standard Development &amp; Implementations</td>
<td>Developing and Updating Training Plan Maintain Training Register and Monitor Plan for Compliance Monitor Quality of Training</td>
<td>Regional External Groups Internal Middle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure Consistency of Operations</td>
<td>Coordinate Training Activities Develop Training Materials Ensure Logistics and Competent Instructors</td>
<td>Local External Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure Security Staff Work to Standards and SOP’s Monitor Maintenance &amp; Administrative Activities Implement &amp; Report on Group Plans</td>
<td>Train Large Groups Develop Training Material &amp; Aids</td>
<td>Supervisors in other Departments and Contracting Companies Administrati ve Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership of Operational Units Ensure Compliance with Standards</td>
<td>Train Small Groups and One on One Contribute to Development of Training Program</td>
<td>Day-to-day follow-up of tasks with supervisors and administrative personnel from other internal groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with SOPs Personal discipline and presentation Knowledge of SOP’s</td>
<td>Participate in training Feedback &amp; improvement suggestions to trainers Personal training and development</td>
<td>Customers, clients and visitors to site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: ISPT Physical Security Guarding Roles Categorisation
The ISPT (2008) suggests that roles need to be aligned to a qualifications framework that provides a visual aid to what qualification(s) the job holder should have. They observe the Risk Management Institute of Australia’s (2008) security practice areas that align to the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF), as seen in Table 6.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AQF</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>ICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security Manager</td>
<td>Vetting Manager</td>
<td>Security Manager</td>
<td>Intelligence Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advanced Diploma (Certification e.g. CPP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>Vetting Manager</td>
<td>Security Manager</td>
<td>Intelligence Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Security Advisor</td>
<td>Vetting Supervisor</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Intelligence Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Certificate IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Installer</td>
<td>Senior Vetting Officer</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Intelligence Operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Certificate III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control Room Operator</td>
<td>Vetting Officer</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Certificate II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Aligning the Australian Qualifications Framework with Security Practice Areas

Professional associations commonly use a certification-based framework, according to the ISPT (2008). They make reference to tiered certification approaches used by the Australian Institute of Project Management and the Australian Facility Management Association. These approaches take into account experience in addition to qualifications. One of the Irish interviewees argued that experience has to be relevant. The ISPT (2008) propose a four tiered, certification-based framework approach for the security sector in their four levels of director, manager, practitioner and technician. Their sample model is seen in Table 6.4.
Table 6.4: ISPT Example of a Tiered Professional Practice Certification Standard

Deij et al. (2013) describe qualification frameworks as classification systems of qualifications based on levels with a focus on knowledge, skills and competence – best referred to as ‘learning outcomes’. They act as a global currency with both national and international value, according to Deij et al. (2013). According to the European Commission the EQF is a translation tool that helps with both communication and comparison between qualifications systems in Europe. Its eight common European reference levels allow any national qualifications systems, frameworks and qualifications in Europe to relate to the EQF levels. Learners, graduates, providers and employers can use these levels to understand and compare qualifications awarded in different countries and by different education and training systems. Each of the eight levels is defined by a set of descriptors indicating the learning outcomes relevant to qualifications at that level in any system of qualifications – seen in Table 6.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQF level</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Basic general knowledge</td>
<td>Basic skills to carry out simple tasks</td>
<td>Work or study under direct supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Basic factual knowledge of a field of work or study</td>
<td>Basic cognitive and practical skills required to use relevant</td>
<td>Work or study under supervision with some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Knowledge of facts, principles, processes and general concepts, in a field of work or study</td>
<td>A range of cognitive and practical skills required to accomplish tasks and solve problems by selecting and applying basic methods, tools, materials and information</td>
<td>Take responsibility for completion of tasks in work or study; adapt own behaviour to circumstances in solving problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Factual and theoretical knowledge in broad contexts within a field of work or study</td>
<td>A range of cognitive and practical skills required to generate solutions to specific problems in a field of work or study</td>
<td>Exercise self-management within the guidelines of work or study contexts that are usually predictable, but are subject to change; supervise the routine work of others, taking some responsibility for the evaluation and improvement of work or study activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comprehensive, specialised, factual and theoretical knowledge within a field of work or study and an awareness of the boundaries of that knowledge</td>
<td>A comprehensive range of cognitive and practical skills required to develop creative solutions to abstract problems</td>
<td>Exercise management and supervision in contexts of work or study activities where there is unpredictable change; review and develop performance of self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advanced knowledge of a field of work or study, involving a critical understanding of theories and principles</td>
<td>Advanced skills, demonstrating mastery and innovation, required to solve complex and unpredictable problems in a specialised field of work or study</td>
<td>Manage complex technical or professional activities or projects, taking responsibility for decision-making in unpredictable work or study contexts; take responsibility for managing professional development of individuals and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Highly specialised knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of knowledge in a field of work or study, as the basis for original thinking and/or research. Critical awareness of knowledge issues in a field and at the interface between different fields</td>
<td>Specialised problem-solving skills required in research and/or innovation in order to develop new knowledge and procedures and to integrate knowledge from different fields</td>
<td>Manage and transform work or study contexts that are complex, unpredictable and require new strategic approaches; take responsibility for contributing to professional knowledge and practice and/or for reviewing the strategic performance of teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowledge at the most advanced frontier of a field of work or study and</td>
<td>The most advanced and specialised skills and</td>
<td>Demonstrate substantial authority, innovation,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at the interface between fields

techniques, including synthesis and evaluation, required to solve critical problems in research and/or innovation and to extend and redefine existing knowledge or professional practice

autonomy, scholarly and professional integrity and sustained commitment to the development of new ideas or processes at the forefront of work or study contexts including research

Table 6.5: EQF Eight Level Descriptor

Levels 1 to 4 seen in Table 6.5 are vocational education awards which also apply to school-level qualifications. Levels 5 to 8 are higher education awards. EU countries have developed their own NFQs. To consider initially that relating to Ireland, the NFQ is set by national legislation - the Qualifications (Education and Training) Act 1999. The Irish NFQ is a system of ten levels, based on standards of knowledge, skill and competence (learning outcomes), which incorporates awards made for all kinds of learning wherever it is gained – inclusive of informal learning. In addition to this 10-level structure the NFQ includes award types of different classes. An award type is a class of named awards (i.e. advanced certificate or Bachelor’s degree with honours) sharing common features and level. These reflect a mix of standards of knowledge, skill and competence which is independent of any specific field of learning. Among these are the large or ‘major’ awards. ‘Major awards’ is the principal class of awards made at each level and they capture a typical range of learning achievements at that level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NFQ Level</th>
<th>Major Award Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Level 1 Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Level 2 Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Level 3 Certificate Junior Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Level 4 Certificate Leaving Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Level 5 Certificate Leaving Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Advanced Certificate Higher Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ordinary Bachelors Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Higher Bachelors Degree Higher Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Masters Degree Postgraduate Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Higher Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Ireland’s NFQ Major Award Types
The NFQ can recognise all training and education under the education system from further education and training to higher education and training awards – ranging from basic literacy awards to doctoral degrees. Qualifications in the NFQ are quality-assured by the QQI regulatory body - so a learner knows that the programme he or she is undertaking, and the provider offering the qualification, is reviewed internally and externally. In addition the NFQ enables learners to compare and contrast awards, and to plan their progression through the Framework, as seen in Figure 6.3 below:

![Image of the National Framework of Qualifications]

**Figure 6.3: Ireland’s NFQ Fan Diagram**

The EQF facilitates mobility across EU borders and allows recognition of national qualifications from other EU member states. What interviewees suggested is that security qualifications should be developed to align to these qualification frameworks and provide consistency across countries. The European Commission provides a tool that allows for finding and comparing qualification frameworks within the EU. For illustration purposes, and referencing the EQF, comparison between Ireland and England and Northern Ireland can be seen in Figure 6.4:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>England and Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 10</td>
<td>EQF Level 8</td>
<td>QCF Level 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Qualifications Level 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 9</td>
<td>EQF Level 7</td>
<td>QCF Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Qualifications Level 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Vocational Qualifications Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 8</td>
<td>EQF Level 6</td>
<td>QCF Level 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honours Bachelors Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Qualifications Level 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 7</td>
<td>EQF Level 5</td>
<td>QCF Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5 Vocational Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher National Diplomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 6</td>
<td>EQF Level 4</td>
<td>QCF Level 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5 Vocational Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher National Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 5</td>
<td>EQF Level 3</td>
<td>QCF Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>GCE AS and A Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Vocational Qualifications Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Skills Level 3 (England only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 4</td>
<td>EQF Level 2</td>
<td>QCF Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>GCSEs Grades A*-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Diploma (England Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Vocational Qualifications Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional Skills at Level 2 (England only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Skills at Level 2 (N. Ireland Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 3</td>
<td>EQF Level 1</td>
<td>Entry Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFQ Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.4: Comparing National Qualification Frameworks**

The above helps to compare qualifications among EU countries and it is this type of system that would allow comparison of security qualifications. Deij *et al.* (2013) summarize the differing systems that exist outside the EU, as seen in Figure 6.5:
Comprehensive Frameworks | NQFs in TVET Sector | Labour Competency Frameworks | NQFs in Higher Education | No National Frameworks | Equivalency Frameworks in Basic Education
---|---|---|---|---|---
Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Mauritius, Seychelles, Malaysia, Philippines, Rwanda, Hong Kong SAR, India, Maldives, Republic of Korea, United Republic of Tanzania, Mexico | Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Maldives, Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, Ghana, Gambia | Mexico, Chile, Hong Kong SAR, India, Vietnam, Republic of Korea, Malaysia | Malaysia, Rwanda, Canada, Philippines | USA, Japan | Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Ethiopia, Kenya, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Botswana, Mauritius, Namibia, South Africa, Seychelles, Ghana, Gambia, Mexico

*TVET refers to Technical Vocational Education and Training

**Figure 6.5: Qualification Frameworks throughout the World**

Some of the above regions are well-prepared for security career pathways as they can align qualification frameworks. However some are not; for instance, the US does not have national frameworks. The latter led to mixed opinions among American interviewees on the subject of aligning qualification frameworks. They do exist throughout Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa; therefore interviewees in these regions were familiar with them and had a better understanding of them.

Arguably, the lack of a qualification framework in the US is one of the key contributors as to why it is difficult to both determine to whom the CPP is aimed and to understand the level of expertise of its holders. One of the American interviewees observed that the CPP does not travel well outside the US. One of the Irish interviewees suggested the reason for this is that it is difficult to align it to the NFQ. The ISPT (2008) has mapped the CPP to level 7 on the AQF. They suggest it is best suited to an operations manager, vetting manager, security manager or intelligence manager. Nonetheless, American interviewees remained keen on an international standardized security education model, and there was a view amongst other interviewees that there should be a common standard for security training and education, as illustrated by Spanish and Irish interviewees:

“All competence and qualifications should be the same throughout Europe.” (1-21)
“Commonality of training and education regardless of location is required, and these should be clearly identified on qualification frameworks that allow clear comparison between countries and recognised progression opportunities.”(1-01)

Some interviewees suggested that an international common security qualification framework is particularly relevant in today’s globalization era with multinationals trying to hire people with the same level of security training and education regardless of the region. A security competency model and qualifications framework would create progression opportunity and may challenge one of the main barriers for progression, namely the dominance of ex-protective force personnel. Additionally, it would cater for objective hiring and RPL. Once developed, everyone would be on the same competence platform, according to one of the American interviewees. They argued that it was the development of a competency model for the US Air Force in the 1970s that allowed for transparent hiring and progression as candidates were hired and promoted based on proven competence that was referenced to the competency model.

Once developed, a security competency model would also allow educational bodies and employers to judge RPL. Irish and Spanish interviewees suggested that when the competence for every role was known it would be easy to see what competence experienced practitioners had through testing their experience against these. They referred to the CEMES (Competence Evaluation Method for European Specialists) tool as a means of doing this. The tool was developed by the German software developer IBS; it won the 2006 Helsinki-Award in the category of Transparency and Recognition of Knowledge by the European Commission. CEMES allows the input of developed competences and a correspondence examination process. Once all competences are developed and agreed, these are input into CEMES and an examination process created that allows testing of the competence at the relevant EQF level. It is of value such that it identifies what examinees know against what they need to know.

The CEMES tool not only allows mobility but also caters for informal learning, according to the Spanish interviewee. However, as one of the Irish interviewees observed, for this to work for all regions and levels, common competences need first to be developed. They argued that after the competences are developed, through the CEMES tool they would be tested on a range of competences in a test centre with a pass mark set for each competence.
Those who failed to reach the pass mark would be expected to subsequently study the competence in which they were unsuccessful. The competences they passed would go towards the award, however the award would not be given until all competences were passed. Additionally this method of direct assessment is in the spirit of LLL according to the European Commission. Furthermore, as the Spanish interviewee points out:

“It allows [for] movement from one country to another with your security qualification, and you can go to a test centre and ask to do the security test to get the country’s security qualification or you can just do one of the competences that you don’t have like administrative law or some other law that is not the same.” (1-21)

Referring back to the ASIS competency model for security management, the latter reinforces the changes occurring in the workplace with organisations looking to business managers rather than traditionalists for security manager roles. However, in doing this, some interviewees cautioned that ex-protective force personnel should not be excluded as those retired from the police and military bring expertise that is not found in the private sector. They suggested finding a solution to accommodate this concern. One of the American interviewees advocated the development of transition programme for ex-protective force personnel:

“The security sector is heavily reliant on law enforcement and the military and the reality is they are the backbone of the industry and will continue to be so and we have to develop a model that allows them to transition to the private sector.” (1-14)

The RPL option of testing competences in a test centre may be a plausible solution but another option, according to one the Irish interviewees, is ‘grandfathering’ very experienced long-standing practitioners. Waddle (1979) indicates that the grandfather clause means that some experienced practitioners may be exempt from completing long programmes of study. Another interviewee with a background in the financial sector highlighted the QFA (Qualified Financial Advisor) award. The same interviewee observed that the grandfather clause is widely used in other sectors, and they provided an example of how it worked in banking where existing employees were required to acquire the QFA:
“If you worked in banking you had to study for the QFA but you might have been entitled to grandfathering. It was based on your length of service which was determined by the bankers’ institute, and there was a provision that you engaged in annual CPD afterwards which was made [up] of a certain amount of hours per year to keep your qualification, but you could do some of these online with the bankers’ institute with a unique log on.” (1-08)

They reported that there was a criterion and an independent institute with oversight. Another interviewee observed that if grandfathering was to be an option for the security sector there would need to be a transparent method of doing so and a framework would need to be developed and overseen by an independent body.

**Collaboration and Research**

Collaboration and Research was noted by most interviewees as one of the key ways to develop career pathways, as illustrated by the Spanish, American and Irish interviewees:

“A group needs to be formed that develops the competences and qualifications, and this could be working groups of people from security.” (1-22)

“Scientific research is what is needed to identify the career path needs, and this should take in the views of all representatives of the industry.” (1-13)

“To define what career paths should look like there needs to be high level research that informs its development, and it needs to take into account the views of all interested stakeholders.” (1-01)

The Spanish interviewee referred to the already-mentioned *KOMSI* project. They argued that this is a model worth considering as a vehicle for developing a common set of competences at each level. They explain that the *KOMSI* project was a European-funded LLL project. It brought a group of sector stakeholders together from Germany, Ireland, Spain, and Slovenia. The group was representative of trade unions, trade associations, training and certification bodies, researchers, practitioners, students, and security training and module development subject matter experts. Over a period of two years they developed a set of common competences for entry level security guarding mapped to level three on the EQF.
Other sectors have LLL research projects of a similar nature developing common competences. For instance, within retail, the RETAIL Sector Skills Alliance is currently working on a project. Another older example is the construction sector; Egan (1998 and 2003) highlights how the construction sector came together through a taskforce aimed at developing career pathways as part of an overall professionalism strategy. A further example is the insurance sector. In recent years the sector’s image has been open to question. In turn, through the Chartered Insurance Institute (CII) a taskforce developed eight key principles of professionalism. Their approach was based on eight key principles of the 2010 Aldermanbury Declaration. These are based on a set of standards. The latter includes practitioners possessing professional qualifications to underpin career development and people in key leadership and management positions are required to be members of an appropriate professional body and hold relevant qualifications. The CII indicate that the Aldermanbury Declaration attracts more talented people to a career in insurance. The legal profession has fallen foul of poor professional practice, and it has had to raise its standards in both the public and consumer interest. In the UK, the Clementi Report (2004) proposed a number of recommendations that included a strong emphasis on competence requirements. Accountancy is another profession that has joined forces to develop initiatives to train their staff in the wake of scandals. We are reminded (Jahmani and Dowling, 2008) that in the wake of the Enron and WorldCom corporate accountancy scandals subsequent regulations were required in order to restore public confidence. A key element of this strategy includes recruitment, retention and promotion though the provision both of a structured career pathway and of development opportunities.

If creating the body of knowledge through collaboration and research is to be the way forward, then there is a requirement for either someone or a group of people to lead the way. All interviewees suggested that to do this, leadership is required from within the sector. Some interviewees considered that the regulator should take this on, as illustrated by one of the Irish interviewees:

“They are the competent authority, they are the regulator and it is up to them to set and maintain the standards for the industry.” (1-02)

However, this is not the view shared by all interviewees, as illustrated by British, Canadian and Irish interviewees:
“They should be involved but that’s all; it is not their job to create career pathways, it is their job to regulate and so far they have made a mess of that, so I would not leave them near it but you are dealing with civil servants who know very little about the private security sector.” (1-10)

“The problem with them is they think they know, they have a history of leading through dictatorship, not consensus, so for them to take the lead would not be a good idea and they would have no support within the sector so it would fall flat on its face before it started.” (1-03)

“They don’t have the industry at heart, they are just interested in generating money and are only another government quango looking after their own jobs, plus they don’t have the expertise to develop career paths and [they] don’t go to the industry to look for help.” (1-06)

Button (2011) suggests that since its inception, regulation has not delivered on what it said it would do. He reminds us of the security management gap regulators have created, and, as well as a gap, regulation has to be seen as an operational risk to organizations that rely on the regulator solely to ensure the most competent personnel are available in security management positions. The KOMSI project tested the competence levels of security guards who had been through this mandatory training and found that most failed. A further issue according to some interviewees is that the regulator has not adopted refresher and up-skilling training in most regions.

Regulation in America holds little weight when it comes to setting standards associated with training and education; this is generally the role of professional associations according to American interviewees. Arguably, though, while there is a view that regulators are not the answer, the sector itself has done little to bridge this gap; instead they seem to be waiting for someone else to do it. Indeed, it was the fact that the sector was not able to self-regulate that led to the government having to step in to regulate them (Button and George, 2006). The traditionally-learned professions self-regulate, and this is an aspect of their being a true profession; however, state intervention was still required due to malpractice at some stage or another. Therefore, it would be naive to think there is no place for state
regulation with the private security sector and, as some interviewees suggested, dual regulation may work.

Some interviewees suggested forming one international independent oversight peer group that all others would feed into. Through this it would develop objectivity and impartiality and a model for self-regulation. The idea is that they would also drive the sector through research, development and innovation. The common theme that emerged from interviewees was that leadership needed to come from the sector and not from government. Akin to Neal and Morgan’s (2000) dual regulation model previously highlighted, it should involve the government as one stakeholder; the innovation of the sector and the standards it develops can also be adopted. One of the Irish interviewees highlighted the other stakeholders that need to come together to form a leadership group that would drive professionalism and create career paths:

“The stakeholders required include training development and certification associations and institutes, trade representative bodies, universities, academics and researchers, the unions and employee representatives, subject matter experts, security provider employers, the client and the regulator.” (1-01)

Some interviewees argued that women in security and young people should be included as a representative body. Notably, those who procure security are seen as the most influential leaders who should be taking the lead, according to most interviewees. One of the ways they can do this is setting expectations through the tendering process of security contracts, as illustrated by one of the British interviewees:

“Vendor management can be dictated through tendering and standards for qualifications can be set at this stage, and this can be performance-managed through the lifecycle of the contract.” (1-09)

This interviewee came from a very progressive human capital development organization and as an individual they are a leader of change within the sector. Some interviewees suggested that not all buyers of security would be as keen due to increased standards meaning increased cost. Interviewees observed that the Government is the largest client of the private security sector. They suggested the Government should take a leading role in professionalizing the sector and creating opportunities to develop career pathways.
Employees need to buy in to career pathways and its associated training and educational elements, according to interviewees. Most interviewees argued that career paths would be embraced by younger progressive security practitioners; however, they suggested that there would be resistance amongst the older established cohort. Some interviewees highlighted a way of addressing this would be that the older ones took retirement and that new entrants to the sector would be increasingly required to have a qualification.

Universities are seen as an important stakeholder, according to interviewees. Universities carry out the scientific research, create the body of knowledge and provide the higher security management education. Interviewees argued that universities need to embrace security as an academic subject, as expressed by this Irish interviewee:

“To create the career path summit and for it to be seen as a serious career the universities need to get involved and create the higher education options in the countries where security management is not available.” (1-04)

As already highlighted, some regions lack undergraduate and postgraduate qualification options. Therefore, the sector needs to work with universities to set up these courses that provide the qualifications. Ireland is one such country where higher security management education is not available – the highest qualification one can progress to is a Diploma in Security Management at vocational level 6 on the NFQ. It is through the use of the NFQ and qualifications development that universities need to become involved, according to some interviewees, and create Bachelor and Master’s degree security risk management options. Those with a higher education qualification in security management as opposed to a vocational one will be better qualified, and they will be at the same level as their peers in others sectors. The result is a better qualified workforce in the public interest. Additionally, other qualifications need development, according to Irish and British interviewees:

“Qualifications need to be developed, but it needs to move away from the traditional security based ones or supplement them, for instance short courses act as CPD and provide for constant updating of knowledge and skills. What a lot of them [practitioners] need is courses like roster management, loss investigation management, HR and general business skills.” (1-02)
“We need to be looking at the soft skills they don’t have and provide these but to do this the industry needs to come together to discuss and agree its educational needs and get buy in from higher educational institutions to create a pathway.” (1-07)

“An eye to the future is necessary, look at what’s happening with security, it is becoming more and more cyber based, why aren’t physical security managers doing cyber security courses and why are those who provide the educational routes not providing a cyber pathway for the physical security manager. They need to do this or they will be left behind.” (1-09)

Some interviewees argued that through collaboration and research a progression path can also be determined from contract security to corporate security. They further note that both can easily provide progression opportunities to roles that are not just security-related, as expressed by one of the Irish interviewees:

“Qualifications need to be defined that gets a client services security manager out of the contract sector and into the in-house [corporate security manager] one. They should be considering progression opportunities to business roles. Security guards can be prepared for roles like the health and safety manager and the HR manager.” (1-07)

Interviewees also held the view that security employers should be looking to create specialist options, as explained by the Canadian interviewee:

“They should be looking to create specialism options that provide career path opportunities in areas like fraud, audit, safety, investigation, [and] cyber and control room.” (1-17)

Some interviewees argued that a group of security providers coming together to lead change, sponsoring career pathway research, investing in their staff and implementing career pathways within their own organizations would offer a way forward. One of the American interviewees suggested looking towards developing an international standard for providing security services which would include the training and education requirements; this would provide a consistent service delivery regardless of location.
The importance of changing the culture was acknowledged by all interviewees if developing career paths is to be realized. Most interviewees argued that commercial providers will overtly support the development of clearer career paths. However, they also observed that such employers will be less supportive in practice because training and education are a drain on their profits. On the positive side, most interviewees argued that a new form of security manager and trade organization leader are emerging from backgrounds that support professional development. This new form of leadership, they suggested, will help break the culture. Additionally, as observed earlier in this chapter, they point to the need for a coming together of key sector stakeholders to lead the way in developing career pathways and provide for other initiatives such as mentoring and graduate programmes. Combining these, they suggested, is the way to help positively change the culture and promote career pathways.

**Discussion**

Developing a security competency model and a qualifications framework would provide the foundation for a structured career path. As part of this, roles would need clear definition so they could be seen in a career pathway to the summit CSO role. The path from contract to corporate security would also need developing in addition to specialist roles, some of which may be functional rather than managerial. Internationally, there has been activity in this area recently. The sector can point to the ASIS Foundation, Skills for Security, the ISPT and a KOMSI working group; the latter’s work is considered very beneficial and provides a firm foundation for a more collaborative unified approach. An international qualifications framework is the way forward; aligning qualifications frameworks in the EU, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand would be straightforward as they exist in these regions. However, in the US qualification frameworks do not exist. Whilst it is difficult to reference qualification frameworks with regards to the US nonetheless this is not seen as a major barrier.

A unified international competency model would assist with RPL, providing a platform to test and recognise informal learning. Utilizing the CEMES tool as a platform for inputting competences will work for RPL; it will provide an understanding of what the practitioner knows and identify the gaps in what they should know from completing a test both of their knowledge and skills in a test-centre. Furthermore, it will provide a tool for developing common competences for all roles, utilizing relevant qualification level action verbs to describe the learning outcomes. The *KOMSI* project group utilized this model, and it has
been tried and tested in other sectors. Additionally, it provides for the transparent hiring and promotion of security practitioners as they are all on the same level.

Developing career pathways supports the private security sector’s goal towards professionalism with training and education underpinning both that and career paths. Key ingredients towards the sector being successful in developing career pathways and professionalism are leadership and sector support. Leadership must come from sector stakeholders and a range of first and postgraduate security risk management programmes needs to be available in all regions to support the progression opportunities towards the CSO summit role. In addition, CPD options, qualifications for specialist roles and a transition model for the police and military needs to be developed. A coming together of minds to develop these is required to understand what form the latter should take. Collaboration and research is required to develop an international security competency model and qualifications framework. There are a number of sector stakeholders that should be involved who can come together and, through working groups, develop sector career pathways through consensus. At the heart of this is scientific research towards developing the body of knowledge that underpins the private security occupation, whilst also developing researchers and pracademics.
Chapter 7 – Conclusion

Summary of the Findings
This chapter brings together the conclusions from this study of security career paths. Research on private security career paths was found to be sparse, although there is some literature on private security training and education that predominantly refers to entry level mandatory training set by regulation (Button and George, 2006; Nalla and Wakefield, 2014; White, 2010; CoESS, 2014). Notably, regulatory systems differ and there is great variance of mandatory training throughout Europe. It was also concluded that research on security managers is scant, particularly on the contract security manager (Button, 2011), however, there is emerging literature on the corporate security manager (Lippert and Walby, 2014) to support earlier research (Manuta, 1998, Dalton, 2003). The limited research that is available on contract security managers suggests they mostly hail from police and military backgrounds (Hearnden, 1993, Manuta, 1998, Button, 2011). Hearnden’s (1993) British research argued that security managers did not engage in training and education or feel they need to as a means of progression. Some twenty years later, ASIS (2013) recognised that the situation is slowly changing with more and more senior executive security managers holding postgraduate qualifications in their subject matter.

Drawn from a variety of countries, the research participants were consistent in their views across the jurisdictions represented in the study, arguing that the security sector lacks the main elements of a career path, limiting the options beyond entry level security guarding. They observed that the progression route in the contract sector is short and narrow; supervisor or middle management is typically the best one can progress to. They suggested that the size of the security provider and how it is structured is a determining factor. The large national and multi-national companies have the ability to provide a progression model; however, they suggested that corporate security management is where contractor practitioners aspire to work.

The role of the CSO was identified as the career path summit role that candidates aspire to, but it was noted that routes to achieving this were not clear. Historically, these roles have typically been taken by ex-protective force personnel and interviewees saw this as the main barrier to the progression of those already working in junior corporate roles. It was established from the literature (Button, 2011) and interviews that the favouritism towards
former protective forces personnel has created a glass ceiling and an old boys’ network that discourages new entrants and limits diversity. Such favouritism forces good candidates out of the sector or discourages them from applying in the first place, and middle management is often the furthest those from non-protective force backgrounds can progress. The perception is that unless one has a police or military background, getting into security or progressing within it, particularly at management level, will not happen. However, the interviewees recognised that the world is evolving and becoming more interconnected and with the threat landscape changing, so is the background of the CSO with a new breed of security manager emerging from business and academic backgrounds. Notably, there are a growing number of such individuals holding first and postgraduate degrees in their subject matter and there is an emergence of security ‘pracademics’.

Research participants argued that for career driven security practitioners, moving from contract security to corporate security is seen as the major opportunity for progression in the absence of a viable career path structure within the contract sector. Interviewees argued that a reason that defined career paths are absent is the esoteric nature of security. Defined roles and responsibilities are a key element of a career path (Cao and Thomas, 2013) and, as the research participants recognised; when a role is poorly defined it is difficult to align the required competence. The knock-on effect is that the necessary training and education for each role are hard to determine and candidates therefore struggle to identify the skills that they need.

The research participants felt that there is currently little drive from those who employ senior security practitioners directly or indirectly to force them to have security qualifications, while mandatory training does not require them to be trained. They argued that a reason for the lack of transparency in hiring and promotion is because they have no competency model, qualifications framework or RPL system that they can refer to so they can determine competence. Instead, their fall-back position is ex-protective force personnel, who they see as coming from occupational backgrounds that society places trust in. This contrasts with often negative public images of the private security sector and its people due to perceptions of unprofessional practices and incompetence that are regularly promoted in politics and the media.

The participants noted that entry level security personnel struggle to be promoted. However, they suggested that few of them are interested in making a career in the sector.
For most, they argued, security work serves as a stop gap. The security officer profile can be best described as ‘wannabe somewhere else’ (Button, 2011). This is due to the role of security officer not being seen as an attractive career option and is stigmatized as a dirty job (Lofstrand et al., 2015) that no one else wants to do, offering poor pay and working conditions and providing limited progression opportunities (Gill et al., 2013). Interviewees reported that its low level entry criterion attracts unskilled workers who cannot find work elsewhere; retirees from the police and military and other occupations looking for a warm comfortable retreat until they retire; students who use shift work as a means of study and to earn a wage to pay their way through college; migrants and those who are between jobs and are waiting for something better to come along. Consequently, interviewees suggested that contract security providers are not likely to invest in developing their staff as they believe they will move on. This results in the sector being a transient one that offers no career development opportunities.

The interviewees suggested that promotion is not based on proven competence and instead that it is based on the Peter Principle. Practitioners’ progress based on how well they performed in their prior role, rather than the skills required for the intended role. Typically, for one to be deemed competent, they complement their experience with training and education (Peter and Hull, 1969). However, it was felt that this is not the case in private security and the attitude to training and education is generally very poor amongst practitioners and those who employ them. Furthermore, unless training and education is linked to mandatory training set by regulation it is either not undertaken or completed by security personnel under duress and paid for under duress by private security employers.

In addition to ex-protective force security managers, interviewees suggested that some of the top of the house corporate security roles are being taken up by accountants. This was considered a failing within the sector in terms of its ability to develop its own senior specialists, sending a poor signal to those aspiring to progress into such roles. Thus, as interviewees argued, in the absence of a security competency model and qualifications framework, advancement opportunities are being limited and interest in a private security career discouraged. They also highlighted that higher education in security risk management is not available in many regions of the world, making it very difficult indeed for aspiring security managers to learn their trade. The research participants strongly believed that lifelong learning is not yet an inherent a feature of their sector.
They argued that to devise the foundations of a structured career path the sector urgently needs to professionalize, and be seen as having the core elements of a profession, most notably training and education routes. Having a proven blend of experience, skills and qualifications is seen to equate to competence (Waite, 2007), therefore, as interviewees argued, practitioners need to hold security qualifications relevant to their role or intended role that complements their experience and engage in lifelong learning. To achieve this, interviewees argued that the sector needs to develop an international competence model aligned to a qualifications framework. This would provide the career progression ladder and lattice while also providing a model for RPL. Additionally, this occupational boundary and professional closure would help provide for objective hiring and promotion. It was also believed that collaboration and research is needed, with the sector coming together as one and invests, support and engages in research as a means of underpinning its practice and future proofing roles. The interviewees suggested that moving the sector forward will need a new form of leadership that professionalizes security and promotes it as a career.

**Implications of the Findings**

As a result of these gaps, the sector may be creating an operational human resource management risk and contributing to organizational security vulnerability and, as policing partners, risk to society as a whole. This is due the lack of investment in people and allowing individuals to take up security roles without being proved competent. Training and education underpin professionalism, yet it was concluded that many leaders within the sector do not see the value of lifelong learning, promote it as a means of progression, adopt the strategic HRM business benefits of it, or seem to see it as a way of professionalizing the sector. Instead, there is a heavy reliance on experience rather than a combination of skills, qualifications and experience.

The world is evolving, threats to society and to business and organizations are becoming more and more complex and austerity sees the police struggling to operate within the scope of their allocated resources. This has created opportunity for arguably the employers of the largest global workforce, the private security sector. They have taken advantage of one of society’s greatest needs and the growth of the sector has in turn provided career path opportunities that are yet to be widely developed. One of society’s greatest needs is undermined by a sector that is not as a competent as it should be considering its role in an ever-changing world. Private security will continue to take advantage of organizational outsourcing opportunities and act as a key partner to public security agencies. It urgently
needs to be better equipped to make evidence-led security risk management decisions, in order to address the security challenges it is responsible for protecting against.

**Key Recommendations**

There is significant challenge ahead if the sector wants to create the foundations of a career path. Based on the themes that have emerged from this research the researcher proposes a sector hierarchy progression model as set out in Figure 7.1.

![Security Hierarchy Diagram](image)

*Figure 7.1: A Suggested Hierarchy Progression Model*

At the top of the tree is the CSO. As Barauch (2008) observes, there must be a career path summit role in sight that can be aspired to. This is the in-house security management position that sets the organization’s security management strategy, oversees it and reports to the board. The post-holder’s experience should be in general business management and functional security management gained from a business environment, rather than direct entry from the protective forces.

It is proposed that sector leaders should have a balanced business and security education and be educated to postgraduate level. Arguably the emphasis should be on a BSc first and foremost attained before achieving an MSc: there are many experienced practitioners parachuting into studying for the MSc in Security and Risk Management without first
gaining a rounded education. Many experienced security practitioners have not completed university programmes at all, and have little foundation competence in higher education programmes. Some approach the MSc with experience only and others come with a basic guarding or supervisory qualification at vocational level. By going straight to the MSc, they bypass a number of rungs on the ladder. Practitioners should also hold relevant vocational qualifications, one such example being the CPP. To keep current in what is happening in the security and business world they should engage in CPD and gain certifications from short courses that up-skill their knowledge and skills as the security business world evolves. Table 7.1 proposes competency statements for the CSO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competency Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Customer Impact &amp; Commercial Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stakeholder Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>People Development &amp; Change Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Collaboration, Research &amp; Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negotiation and Influencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Corporate Administration &amp; Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Governance &amp; Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Business Continuity, Recovery &amp; Crisis Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Managing Cyber Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Globalization, Transnational Crime and Emerging Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Managing Security and Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Security Metrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.1: Proposed CSO Competency Statements, Level 9 on the Irish NFQ*

For those senior security executives that achieve the MSc, there is opportunity for them to further their education and become a Security Pracademic, holding a doctorate in their subject matter. This option provides a useful addition to the suite of courses available to them. Hanbury (2004) informs us that pracademia is a culture where a network of like-minded individuals acknowledges the positives of solving real-world problems through mixing practitioner and academic viewpoints. Therefore, a pracademic is a person whose work is heavily influenced by academia or whose academic work is closely connected to the practitioner’s world (Posner, 2009). According to Volpe and Chandler (2001) pracademics may work in either setting, cross from one to the other and vice versa, or straddle both. Hanbury (2004) suggests that pracademia lets pracademics move into the academics’ world and the academic move into the practitioners’ world, thus providing a complete picture of the world they both live in to the good of the subject matter. A
Professional Doctorate in Security Risk Management also provides stepping stone progression from an MSc.

Reporting to the CSO, the Security Manager should support the security strategy of the CSO, develop security management systems and lead the security management team. It is proposed that they have a rounded education attained from having a higher education qualification in business and security management. They should hold subject matter qualifications and certifications in addition to ongoing CPD. It is proposed that they are qualified to Higher Diploma and be a CPP. Ideally, they should possess a background in security operations management and have experience gained from working within a corporate business setting, rather than relying on direct entry from the protective forces. Table 7.2 proposes competency statements for the Security Manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competency Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stakeholder Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Negotiation and Influencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Administration &amp; Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Security Management and Risk Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Investigation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Crisis Management &amp; Disaster Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cyber Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Organised Crime &amp; Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Operational Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Managing Risk and Security in the Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Data Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Security Metrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Proposed Security Manager Competency Statements, Level 8 on the Irish NFQ

The Assistant Security Manager should report to the Security Manager and support and deputize for them. It is proposed that they should hold first degree qualifications in their subject matter, in addition to business qualifications that can be gained at vocational levels such as a Higher Diploma. Their role should be focused on implementing security management systems and ensuring compliance with these, analyzing data from security metrics and reporting upwards. They should develop and deliver training. In addition to their subject matter qualification, it is proposed that they should hold professional qualifications in human resource management, business law, communications,
investigation management, safety management and training and development. Ideally, they should have a background in supervisory security management, have experience of working within a corporate business setting and of leading teams and be able to coach and develop their personnel. They could also come from management positions within public policing; however, it is proposed that they would need to acquire business management experience and qualifications in addition to a transition training programme from public policing to private security. Table 7.3 proposes competency statements for the Assistant Security Manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strategic Management (introduction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internal and External Stakeholder Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Understanding Business Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Human Recourse Management &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Influencing Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research (introduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Criminology (introduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Security Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Investigating Workplace Incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Security, Safety &amp; Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Information Technology &amp; Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Business Continuity &amp; Disaster Recovery (intro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Developing Security Metrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.3: Proposed Assistant Security Manager Competency Statements, Level 7 on the Irish NFQ*

The Security Supervisor would report to the Assistant Security Manager. It is proposed that they should hold entry level undergraduate qualifications in their subject matter, for instance, a Foundation Degree in Risk and Security Management. Their role would be to support the Assistant Security Manager, have oversight of the day-to-day security operations and ensure security officer compliance with standing operating procedures. They should be proficient problem solvers and have the ability to manage emergencies and other issues as they arise that may threaten the security and safety of the environment they protect. They should provide training to their teams and gather security activity data and report upwards. They are first-line management; therefore, they should have additional qualifications in people management, managing employee safety and training and development. Ideally, they should have a background in supervisory security management and have experience of working within a corporate business setting or within service sectors. They could also come from supervisory positions within public policing; however,
they would need to acquire people management experience and qualifications within the private sector. Table 7.4 proposes competency statements for the Security Supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Customer Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IT Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Roster Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negotiating and Influencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supervisory Security Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Loss Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Managing Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Safety, Health &amp; Welfare at Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Employment Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.4: Proposed Security Supervisor Competency Statements, Level 6 on the Irish NFQ*

Reporting to the Security Supervisor, the Security Team Leader would be the link between the Security Officer and junior management. It is proposed that the job holder has a vocational Security Team Leader qualification. Their role would be to provide leadership to their security team and ensure compliance with relevant standards. They would deploy security officers to security activities, conduct daily team briefings, deal with employee relations, resolve disputes and respond to and handle emergencies. They would provide daily security activity reports to the Security Supervisor. Table 7.5 proposes competency statements for the Security Team Leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Customer Service Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervising and Leading People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IT Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Employee Grievance Resolutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roster Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crime &amp; Loss Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reporting Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emergency Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Training and Coaching Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Supervising Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.5: Proposed Security Team Leader Competency Statements, Level 5 on the Irish NFQ*

Arguably, the entry level security officer is already well-defined by regulation. Entry level security officer competences are detailed in Table 6.1 in chapter 6. However, these fail to
fully cover all the competences required of a security officer. One example is in Ireland where security officers who complete mandatory training are not required to undergo physical intervention training. Referring again to the situation prevailing in Ireland since the enactment of the Private Security Services Act in 2004, mandatory training has yet to insist on refresher and up-skilling training of security officers. In the 12 years that have passed since that Act, the security sector, the threat landscape and laws that affect the security officer have evolved; however, the security officer has not.

Progression to security management is not everyone’s ambition. Therefore, creating other progression options that provide opportunity and challenge should assist in attracting and retaining candidates. For those who want to progress to management, specialist security officer roles help to develop the specialist functional foundation competence. Currently, security officer training is generic and is not being developed to complement the specialist areas that security officers work within or aspire to. An example of this can be seen in retail, where retail security provides many career pathways such as loss prevention and investigation. Furthermore; a loss prevention manager may progress out of security and into general retail or business management. Another example is in the financial sector where there may be opportunities to progress into counter fraud roles.

To develop the entry level security officer’s proficiency and competences, their up-skilling through development of additional units that expand their prior learning is required. They do not need to repeat their security officer training course. Instead, through a mapping exercise, their prior learning should be recognized and new training requirements for specialist options developed. These specialist security officer roles should carry a vocational qualification that would provide the stepping stone progression from entry level competence. There are numerous specialist progression options, with suggested ones seen in Table 7.6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry Level Security Guarding Progression Routes to Next Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Patrol &amp; Emergency Response Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command and Control Center / Data Centre Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Security Officer – Air &amp; Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Protection Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.6: Entry Level Security Guarding Progression Options to Next Level*
In addition to the above specialist options, other specialist functional options exist at various levels. Examples are seen in Table 7.7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training &amp; Development</th>
<th>Security Auditing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyber Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marine Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter Fraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disaster and Crisis Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Security Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security Risk Management Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7: Example of Specialist Security Roles to Develop a Career in

As the Canadian interviewee expressed:

“There is a natural security specialist role for every sector of industry or threat faced.” (1-17)

One specialist option at level 5 on the Irish NFQ is to a Museum Security Officer (MSO). The researcher is a practitioner in one of the world’s leading Art Gallery’s and has specific knowledge of this sector and understands the requirements of the role. An Irish working group has been developing the below competency statements that fills the skills gap that
exists in this particular area. A Security Officer working in a Museum needs knowledge and skills specific to cultural heritage buildings. Table 7.8 shows the competency statements for an MSO that provides a progression option from entry level and creates occupational boundary of that sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competency Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Security Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Legal Aspects and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Security Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication in other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Art Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Terrorism Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IT Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Responding to Physical Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Physical Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Event Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Personal Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Manual Handling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.8: Museum Security Officer Competency Statements, Level 5 on the Irish NFQ

To achieve consensus around such a career path, the sector needs to professionalize what it does and how it goes about doing this. It is suggested that the following nine priority areas need to be addressed:

1. Define sector roles & responsibilities to include specialist options
2. Develop common competences and consider the work already done by others
3. Review existing sector qualification frameworks
4. Develop a common international qualifications framework
5. Map the qualifications framework to national and European qualification frameworks
6. Define a sector RPL model
7. Develop partnerships and synergies for the purpose of education, research and innovation
8. Develop/adopt university security programmes in all regions
Additionally, there are significant opportunities for research in the wider world of risk management. These can be recognized considering the known unknowns and unknown unknowns that threaten our very existence and security in an ever-changing, compliance-based, interconnected globalized world. As highlighted by the research participants collaboration and research is required to develop career paths and developing career paths supports the professionalism of the sector.

Research into the wider world of security risk management can be achieved through coming together and utilizing cross border working together. Partnerships and synergies for the purpose of education, research and innovation are important to professionalize the sector. While there is excellent work occurring globally much of it is being completed in silos and indeed there may be duplication of projects occurring and if there was a meeting of minds there could be fully maximized outputs. And as the world becomes more globalised and interconnected much of the synergies for the purpose of education, research and innovation could be easily completed over the internet of things. Another area where partnerships may be beneficial is with security risk management higher education. Those in regions where there are no higher education options in security could partner with a university where it exists, for instance in Ireland there is no higher education and in the UK there is, indeed there may be possibilities for partnership.
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Appendix 2: Letter of Ethical Approval

Mr Declan Garrett  
Professional Doctorate Student  
Institute of Criminal Justice Studies  
University of Portsmouth

REC reference number: 13/14:35  
Please quote this number on all correspondence.

9th October 2014

Dear Declan,

Full Title of Study: Private Security Career Paths: Developing a Progression Model for the Manned Guarding Sector

Documents reviewed:  
Consent Form  
Ethics self-assessment  
Interview Schedule  
Invitation Letter  
Participant Information Sheet  
Protocol

Further to our recent correspondence, this proposal was reviewed by The Research Ethics Committee of The Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

I am pleased to tell you that the proposal was awarded a favourable ethical opinion by the committee.

Kind regards,

FHSS FREC Chair  
Dr Jane Winstone

Members participating in the review:

- Richard Hitchcock
- Geoff Wade
- Jane Winstone
Appendix 3: Invitation Letter

University of Portsmouth
Institute of Criminal Justice Studies
University of Portsmouth
St George’s Building
141 High Street
Portsmouth
PO1 2HY
United Kingdom
Telephone: +353 87 6038428
Email: declan.garrett@myport.ac.uk

<date>
Dear Mr Smith

RE: Research on ‘Private Security Career Paths: Developing a Progression Model for the Manned Guarding Sector’

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to participate in the above research, being undertaken as part of my Professional Doctorate in Security Risk Management with the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth. In my professional practice I am a security and risk management practitioner, and Head of International Research of The Security Institute of Ireland.

This research aims to provide a new body of knowledge in the development of career paths within the manned guarding sector of private security and with your expertise I believe you could provide valuable information to the research. Specifically, I am looking to draw on the perspectives of specialists inside and outside the security sector to develop recommendations for a structured career path to inform entry to, and progression within, the manned guarding sector. The research will be structured around the following research questions:

- How well developed are career paths within the private security sector?
- What models exist inside and outside the security sector to inform the design of workable career structures?
- What should be the main foundations of a well focused career path?

In order to address these questions I intend to conduct a number of semi-structured interviews of up to an hour in duration. Further details are provided in the attached information sheet and consent form, which can be returned to me via e-mail. Participation in this research study is confidential and anonymous. Withdrawal from this research study is easily facilitated up to the point of data analysis.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for taking the time to read this letter regardless of your decision to participate or otherwise. If you require any further information or clarification regarding this research study or your participation in it, you should ask to speak to me by telephone at +353 87 6038428 or by e-mail at declan.garrett@myport.ac.uk, or my supervisor Dr. Alison Wakefield at alison.wakefield@port.ac.uk.

Yours sincerely
Declan Garrett
Appendix 4: Participant Information Sheet

declan.garrett@myport.ac.uk
Participant Information Sheet

Study Title: Private Security Career Paths: Developing a Progression Model for the Manned Guarding Sector

Researcher: Declan Garrett

I am a professional doctoral student in the field of Security Risk Management with the University of Portsmouth, and would like to invite you to take part in my research study. Before you decide I would like you to understand why the research is being done, what it would involve for you and have the opportunity to discuss with you anything that is not clear.

What is the purpose of this study?
The purpose of this research is to devise a structured career path to inform entry to, and progression within, the manned guarding sector of private security sector. The research will be structured around the following research questions:
- How well developed are career paths within the manned guarding sector?
- What models exist inside and outside the security sector to inform the design of workable career structures?
- What should be the main foundations of a well focused career path?

Why have I been invited?
It is proposed that you will be one a number of people from an interest group taking part in this research. Key stakeholders within private security, education and other professions have been selected as being best placed to provide in-depth opinions through experience, knowledge, qualifications, and expertise, in their own area, which will contribute to the development of career paths within the manned guarding sector of private security

What will I have to do?
Your participation in this research will require you to complete a consent form, followed by participation in interview for up to an hour, seeking only your opinion on a variety of themes relating to the research topic. Your participation in this research study would be solely voluntary. Unfortunately renumeration cannot be provided for the time spent during the interview.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?
There are no major foreseeable disadvantages or risks to you taking part in this research study, other than the time contributed. As detailed more fully below, our discussions will be confidential and every effort will be made to anonymise your comments, including removal of
identifying details, unless you would expressly prefer to be quoted as a representative of your sector.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
You will have access to the final report. Your views will be analysed with a view to contributing to recommendations for positive change within the private security industry.

Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?
Your participation in this research study is anonymous, thus, your data will be kept confidential. Data will only be collected for the specific purpose of this research study, in compliance with data protection legislation relevant to your jurisdiction and University of Portsmouth Data Protection Policy and Procedures. Your data will be processed only in ways compatible with the purpose for which you provided it, and it will be kept safely and securely on a password protected computer stored in a locked room. It will be kept for 5 years and consent forms for 13 years after completion of the study.

Personal data includes name, address, telephone number, e-mail address, date of birth, account numbers, signatures, audio and video recording, and photographs. The only personal data which will be used is your contact details to invite you to participate in the research study, and your signature on the consent form. There will be no other personal data gathered. The data I obtain from you during interview will be coded and not recognisable as your name. Your signed consent form and interview answers will not be recognisable to anyone, only I. Any electronic messages which identify you as a participant in this research study will be deleted after it is received by me.

While I have above indicated that I will only have access to your data, if you join the study, it is possible that some of the data collected will be looked at by authorised persons from the University of Portsmouth, specifically the academic supervisor and the thesis examiners, to check that the study is being carried out correctly. All will have a duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant and we will do our best to meet this duty.

It is important to highlight that anonymisation of data is not in itself an assurance of confidentiality; if you are quoted verbatim it might well be possible to identify you, although every effort will be made to remove identifying details. However, you may wish to be named and associated with your data as with some research the participant may see the research as providing them with a voice. If you wish to be named and associated with your data - you will be required to consent to this.

What will happen if I don’t want to carry on with the study?
Following agreement to take part in this research study, you may withdraw as a participant in this research study prior the semi-structured interview, or during the interview. However, once the interview data has been collected it will not be possible for the data to be extracted and destroyed and will be used in the presentation of research findings.

What if there is a problem?
If you have a concern or query about any aspect of this study, you should ask to speak to me by telephone at +353 87 6038428 or by e-mail at declan.garrett@myport.ac.uk, or my supervisor Dr. Alison Wakefield at alison.wakefield@port.ac.uk.

If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do this by contacting the University of Portsmouth’s following personnel:

Samantha Hill
Title: Information Disclosure and Complaints Manager
Tel: +44 (0)23 9284 3642
Email: samantha.hill@port.ac.uk

Thérèse Kearns
Title: Assistant Complaints Officer
Tel: +44 (0)23 9284 3103
Email: therese.kearns@port.ac.uk
Email: complaintsadvice@port.ac.uk
What will happen to the results of the research study?
The result of the research study will be made available to you once the research has been completed and approved by the University of Portsmouth. The results of this research may form part of my final research thesis.

Who is organising and funding the research?
This research is self funded. It is in no way connected to sponsored research by any individual or organisation; this research is solely conducted for the purpose already outlined.

Who has reviewed the study?
Research in the University of Portsmouth is independently reviewed by the University’s Research Ethics Committee, to protect your interests. This study has been favourably reviewed and approval granted to proceed.

Further information and contact details
If you wish to discuss any aspect of the information contained in this information sheet, or requires clarification on the aim of the research, please do not hesitate to contact me. I can be contacted directly by telephone at +353 87 6038428 or alternately by e-mail at declan.garrett@myport.ac.uk.

Concluding statement
Thank you for taking the time to read the information sheet regardless of your decision to participate or not. If you decide to participate you will be given a copy of this information sheet and you will be asked to sign a consent form.

Signed: Declan Garrett

Date: 21st September 2014
Appendix 5: Consent Form

### Study Title: Private Security Career Paths: Developing a Progression Model for the Manned Guarding Sector

**Name of Researcher:** Declan Garrett

1. I confirm I have read and understand the information sheet dated 2nd July 2014 version 1, for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason, up to the point of data analysis.

3. I understand that data collected during the study may be looked at by individuals from University of Portsmouth and stored in accordance with The Data Protection Act 1998. I give permission for these individuals to have access to my data

4. I agree to be quoted verbatim.

5. I agree to be audio taped.

6. I agree to the data I contribute being retained for this stage of the research study and for future thesis research.

7. I agree to be a named participant and quoted by name.

8. I agree to take part in the above study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person recording consent</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 6: Interview Schedule

PRIVATE SECURITY CAREER PATHS:
A PROGRESSION MODEL FOR THE MANNED GUARDING SECTOR

Interview Schedule

Preamble

Many thanks for agreeing to participate in this research on private security career paths. The aim of this research is to devise a structured career path to inform entry to, and progression within, the manned guarding sector. The research will be structured around three main themes:

• How well developed are career paths within the private security sector?

• What models exist inside and outside the security sector to inform the design of workable career structures?

9. What should be the main foundations of a well focused career path?

A copy of the report will be made available to all participants in the research.

The interview is designed to last up to 60 minutes, and will be anonymous and confidential, with respect both to yourself and your organisation, unless you would like to be actively named as a representative of your sector. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and stop the interview at any time.

I would be grateful if you could sign two copies of this consent form, one of which is for you, and let me know if you would be happy for our interview to be recorded.

Thank you very much for giving your time for this interview.

Background
1. Can you outline your background, role, and responsibilities?
   • Current department
   • Level within organisation
   • Previous roles

Assessing the Current Picture
2. Can you outline how the manned guarding sector is structured and defined?
   - Services provided
   - Defined structures
   - Roles and responsibilities defined
   - Entry criteria (all roles)
   - Typical background of new entrants and those already employed
   - Training (availability, adequacy, engagement/attitude)
   - Qualifications available for all roles - mapped to national frameworks?
   - Competency frameworks
   - Assessment instruments
   - Difference between in-house and contract
   - Difference between small, medium, large, multinational contractors

3. What barriers exist for career progression within the manned guarding sector?

4. What career path models exist within the manned guarding sector?
   - How well developed are career paths
   - Ladder style
   - Lattice style
   - Technical progression routes
   - Managerial progression routes

**Industry Needs**

5. What should be the main foundations of a structured career path for the manned guarding sector?
   - Progression routes for technical and managerial
   - Competency frameworks
   - Qualifications at all levels mapped to national frameworks
   - CPD
   - Accounting for those who do not want progression

6. Are there any other industry career path models which could be adopted for the manned guarding sector?

7. What value would a military or policy hierarchy structure have for the manned guarding sector?

**Final Comments**

8. Is there anything else you would like to add that we already being covered?

9. In what other ways do you think the manned guarding sector needs to develop to become more professionalised?

   **Thank you very much for your help**
Appendix 7: Declaration of Ethical Conduct of the Research