

Competences of Security Guards in Slovenia as Assessed by Users and Security Managers

Miha Dvojmoč

Purpose:

The purpose of this paper is to reveal the competence of security guards, mainly through the eyes of security managers and users of security services, in the area of security personnel's competence in carrying out security tasks. In this paper, we wish to ascertain how the guards' competencies are assessed by security managers and security service users, and if their assessments differ. We also analyse whether there are differences between the competencies self-assessed by private security guards and how they are assessed by their managers and service users.

Methods:

For the purposes of the literature review, we analysed domestic and foreign sources and domestic legislation, and conducted a quantitative survey on competencies with all three groups (users of security services, security managers, security guards). For the data collection, we employed a questionnaire to evaluate competencies using a five-point scale.

Findings:

The findings suggest security guards' interpersonal competencies are evaluated better by the users of security services than by security guards themselves. Both security guards and security managers assessed themselves similarly in terms of their own interpersonal competencies. To realise the full potential of the non-government institutional, as well as non-institutional, provision of security, the mentality of the management structures of both the users and providers of security services must change, while also better educating the security personnel, ensuring a suitable salary for their work, and demanding the correct performance of their tasks and duties.

Originality/value:

The paper provides a useful starting point in the field of private security for the development of competence models, which should be based on employee competencies and security services users' needs.

UDC: 351.746.2(479.4)

Keywords: private security, security guards, security managers, users of security services, competencies, quality

Ocena kompetenc zasebnih varnostnikov v Sloveniji z vidika uporabnikov varnostnih storitev ter varnostnih menedžerjev

Namen prispevka:

Namen prispevka je prikazati razvoj zasebnega varovanja v Republiki Sloveniji predvsem skozi oči varnostnih menedžerjev in uporabnikov varnostnih storitev na področju kompetenc varnostnega osebja, ki izvaja varnostne naloge. V prispevku želimo ugotoviti, kako varnostni menedžerji in uporabniki varnostnih storitev ocenjujejo kompetence zaposlenih, ali med njimi prihaja do razkoraka. Prav tako bomo analizirali, ali prihaja do razlik med samooceno kompetenc varnostnikov ter oceno teh kompetenc s strani njihovih vodij in uporabnikov njihovih storitev.

Metode:

Za namene pregleda literature smo analizirali domače in tuje vire ter zakonodajo, v delu kompetenc pa smo opravili anketiranje vseh treh skupin (uporabnikov varnostnih storitev, varnostnih menedžerjev, varnostnikov). Za zbiranje podatkov smo uporabili vprašalnik, kjer smo kompetence ocenjevali s pomočjo petstopenjske lestvice.

Ugotovitve:

Ugotovitve kažejo, da medosebne kompetence varnostnega osebja više ocenjujejo naročniki/uporabniki varnostnih storitev kot varnostniki (varnostno osebje). Za razvoj vseh potencialov nedržavnega institucionalnega zagotavljanja varnosti je treba spremeniti naravnost tako ponudnikov varnostnih storitev kakor tudi uporabnikov varnostnih storitev, hkrati pa izboljšati usposabljanje, predvsem neformalno, varnostnega osebja, ki bo za primerno plačo kvalitetno izvajalo svoje naloge in dolžnosti.

Izvirnost/pomembnost prispevka:

Prispevek predstavlja kratek pregled razvoja zasebnega varovanja v Republiki Sloveniji ter predstavlja enega od izhodišč za razvoj kompetenčnih modelov na področju zasebnega varovanja, ki mora temeljiti na sposobnostih zaposlenih, ki jih pričakujejo in potrebujejo uporabniki varnostnih storitev.

UDK: 351.746.2(479.4)

Ključne besede: zasebno varovanje, varnostniki, varnostni menedžerji, uporabniki varnostnih storitev, kompetence, kakovost

1 INTRODUCTION

Safety is an increasingly valued and protected human right and falls within the responsibility of the government in the national security system framework. Numerous parties have a role in ensuring safety (city warden service, customs, private detectives etc.), among which police and private security companies are the largest (Sotlar & Čas, 2011).

In the period of former Yugoslavia, as well as before, we were traditionally used to police activity being under the auspices of the government which, on top

of having a monopoly over the use of force, had a monopoly on providing security for both its citizens and organisations active within its territory. Such a division was otherwise simple in organisational terms since it was always clear who was responsible for providing security. However, during the last few decades this has proved to be ineffective. The police itself cannot fulfil the promises given on ensuring safety, which applies partially to individuals and especially to companies (Dvojmoč, 2013; Sotlar, 2007).

Therefore, police activities were divided into public policing activities¹ provided by the state, and private policing activities² supplementing state policing and overcoming the limits faced by the public or state police. Here we must also add civil society's activities in providing security. These include civil, non-governmental and non-private organisations performing tasks the state police cannot undertake, but which are not of interest to the private commercial sector. An example of such activity is security surveillance of neighbourhoods. Policing activities within groups of civil society exists in two forms, specifically as the conduct of responsible citizens and as autonomous activity independent of the state and private sector – citizens' actions.

The categorisation into public and private policing activities and the activities of civil society groups in the security field can be viewed as the first true comprehensive policing pattern (Ponsears, 2001). Supplementing the state policing activities with private and civil security activities can also be seen as a reaction to the too limited and too traditional concept of police. The key concepts used to describe the new forms of implementing and ensuring security tasks and services are: fragmentation, rearrangement of police work, un-connectedness, consumer orientation, protection of interests, finesse, privatisation, (non) security and responsibility (Modic, Lobnikar, & Dvojmoč, 2014). The rapid economic development also led to the development of private security with the natural consequence being an increase in employees in such companies (Meško, Nalla, & Sotlar, 2004). Most research performed around the world concerns the relations between police officers and private security guards. For example, Nalla and Newman (1990) note the private security profession often mimics the police culture and application of knowledge. Among the studies examining this relationship, we should mention the study on the transfer of police powers to a private security company in order to reduce the police budget (Stewart, 1985; Walsh & Donavan, 1989) or as a way of extending state control over non-state agencies (Henry in Meško, Nalla, & Sotlar, 2005). Some other studies provide examples of cooperation between police and private security companies in certain cities (Bocklet, 1990; Cunningham & Taylor, 1985).

The only similar study in Slovenia, conducted by Meško (1999), showed that at the end of the twentieth century among police officers and private security guards there were more competitors than collaborators. Private security guards even believed the police had an exploitative relationship with them, especially

1 *Public policing activities in this case include the police on the state level, as well as local policing organisations which in Slovenia are called the municipal warden service and carry out policing tasks within the framework of local government.*

2 *Private policing activities include private security companies, private detectives and security advisors.*

when it came to using information held by private security guards in police activity while, on the other hand, there was neither reciprocity nor respect for the private security guards' work by police officers. According to the security guards, the police behaved towards them more like surveillance and not as partners (Dvojmoč, 2013).

It follows from the above that a study of the competencies and the self-assessed competencies of private security staff can offer a new insight into private security staff competence and lay the foundations for the further development of employees and their competencies.

2 DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATE SECURITY IN SLOVENIA

2.1 Legal Framework for Private Security in Slovenia

Under the Companies Act (1988) and in line with an ever more expressed entrepreneurial spirit, the first, modern private security companies were established in 1989. This process took two paths. On one hand, the SOZD Varnost Ljubljana was terminated and its TOZD organisations restructured (under the same or new names) as independent joint stock or limited responsibility companies (Sotlar & Dvojmoč, 2016).

While, for example, the Basic Court of Ljubljana upon registration very precisely defined the activities of Enigma, podjetje za varovanje premoženja, d.o.o. (physical and technical security, transportation, security and accompanying of money and other shipments, provision of persons and buildings etc.), the Institute of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia for Statistics listed the same company's area of activity as "other unlimited communal activities" (Čas, 1999).

In 1994, the Private Security and Obligatory Organisation of Security Services Act (1994, 1997) was adopted. From today's perspective, it was a revolutionary law. It mainly brought the introduction of licences³, a definition of who may carry out private security activity, in which way⁴ and with what kind of personnel⁵, while the supervision of the activity and the obligatory organising of security services was defined (Sotlar & Dvojmoč, 2016).

3 The Act introduced two licences, physical provision and technical provision. Physical provision was defined as "provision of persons and property from destruction, damage, theft, and other forms of harmful activity", while the technical provision was "provision of persons and property with technical assets and devices according to prescribed standards".

4 Activities were permitted for business companies, independent entrepreneurs/individuals and independent craftsmen who had to obligatorily unite within the Chamber of the Republic of Slovenia for Private Security which, in harmony with the Ministry of Internal Affairs, issued and withdrew licences for the activity of private security.

5 Security guards had to have Slovenian citizenship, elementary professional training (between elementary and middle school, depending on the job), pass a knowledge and ability test, be psychologically and physically competent for security guard work, and fulfil the condition of impunity. An additional condition for security technicians was middle school education in a technical direction. The profession of "responsible persons" was introduced (security managers or directors), who were legally responsible for all activities of security services. These persons were frequently (but not always) also the owners of security services and, of course, had to fulfil higher professional and education standards than the security guards and security technicians. Along with other conditions, they had to have at least a higher school education and five years of suitable work experience.

Due to the development of private security, the rapid rise in the numbers of both private security companies and security guards, the regime established by the Private Security and Obligatory Organisation of Security Services Act from 1994 was insufficient for efficiently regulating both the discipline and field operations on one end, and the operation of the field on the other, so in 2003, a new Private Security Act (2003) was passed.

To carry out private security activities, one first had to obtain the appropriate licence (for one or several forms of provision) which, according to the new regulations, was issued by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. It was also obligatory to become a member of the Chamber of the Republic of Slovenia for Private Security, which had lost its public authority to issue licences. To obtain a licence, the Act prescribed fairly strict conditions.⁶ The Private Security Act (2003) introduced six licenses, namely for: security provision for persons; (2) security provision for property; (3) security provision for transportation, money and other valuable shipments; (4) security provision for public gatherings; (5) management of a security/supervision centre; and (6) planning and implementing security systems. With legal changes in 2007, the last licence was split into two licences: planning of security systems and the implementation of security systems (Sotlar & Dvojmoč, 2016).

The currently valid Private Security Act (2011) manages the rights and obligations of not only business companies and independent entrepreneurs, as was the case before, but also for state authorities, institutes, public agencies and other legal entities and material persons in the field of security not ensured by the state (Sotlar & Čas, 2011).

The main characteristics of the new law are the following: the Ministry of Internal Affairs' competencies in the area of private provision are further expanded; there are still too many norms in the field of private provision; the chamber has some of its authorities restored, even though membership in it is no longer obligatory; the number of measures and other resources of security guards is increased; the conditions for security guards' use of individual measures are expanded; the provisions on the professional ID of security personnel are more thorough and broader; special emphasis is given to training and upgrading security personnel's knowledge; in-house security is introduced. The Private Security Act (2011) divided the activity of private security into eight forms or eight licenses (Sotlar & Dvojmoč, 2016).

The security function performed by private security companies is not just physical and technical security, protection of the transport of money and other valuables, managing control centres and providing security at events, but is an activity that – for the purpose of providing the mentioned forms of security – plans, organises and monitors many types of dangers and factors that represent a certain level of risk in both the internal and external environment.

⁶ *General conditions for obtaining the licence were: that the company has an individual responsible for the private security operations (security manager), that there are no public order issues for owners, legal representatives, and members of the supervisory board, that it has its own or contractually ensured security/supervision centre and that it is insured for damage liability which might occur in its work (Private Security Act, 2003: Article 30), while individual licences also had particular conditions of their own.*

We may conclude the entire development of private safety and therefore private security took the path of strong regulation in the field which, while an advantage, also hinders the development of private security in the Republic of Slovenia (Modic et al., 2014). The regulation acts as a hindrance especially when considering that private security is prohibited from doing anything other than that explicitly permitted by the legislation, but this is only partly true because the options for ensuring safety and security are very wide.

It is precisely due to the interests of most private security companies, directly relating to profit and side payments, that the government must regulate the private security field and supervise the legality of these services. It therefore cannot completely shed responsibility for the state of security in environments, areas and spaces where private security is implemented (Sotlar, Dvojmoč, & Tominc, 2016).

Some also promote the deregulation of private security in Slovenia (Slak, 2014), although this is not possible without having trust in the providers of private security services. One study (Meško, Sotlar, Lobnikar, Jere, & Tominc, 2012) used a five-point scale – where 1 represents a complete lack of trust and 5 represents a high level of trust – to measure trust in private security, and determined the average level of trust at \bar{x} 2.87 only a little less than the level of trust in the police at \bar{x} 2.98 (Meško et al., 2012). For this specific reason, the competencies of security personnel, including interpersonal ones, are essential for private security companies to provide high-quality security and the related customer and client satisfaction, the better performance of services and at the same time an increased sense of safety as a commodity.

All companies on the market providing private security services should endeavour to follow the goals of politeness and orderliness, flexibility, responsiveness and professionalism.

2.2 Competencies and Private Security

Bratton and Gold (2003) define competencies as the individual's characteristics that reflect the efficacy of conducting work once all organisational circumstances are taken into account. Bohlander and Snell (2004), however, primarily associate competencies with knowledge and do not pay as much attention to the individual's personal characteristics as other authors. Regarding competencies, Svetlik (2005) adopts the definition by Perrenoud (1997) and states competencies are an individual's capacity to activate, use and integrate knowledge acquired in complex, varied and unpredictable situations. As competencies, or more specifically their components, Kohont (2005b) recognises: knowledge, abilities, skills, personal characteristics, behavioural forms, values and motivation.

Apart from researchers, politicians and economists also discuss competencies. The European Commission defines competencies as a mixture of knowledge, abilities and attitudes held by an individual towards their work. Rozman (2005) presents a definition of competencies used by the Merkur company, stating: Competencies are abilities and capabilities needed for an individual to efficiently and successfully perform a certain task. They include knowledge, experience, personality traits, abilities, motives, self-image, traits and characteristics,

behaviour, as well as the physical and mental skills of an individual. The example of the Caterpillar company, which sees competencies as the ability for interpersonal communication, the ability to resolve problems, the ability to lead, the ability to plan and organise, responsibility, flexibility, and the ability to assess and trust one's own knowledge, is discussed by Bohlander and Snell (2004).

Boyatzis (Kohont, 2005b) defines the individual's competencies as a mixture of the motives, abilities, self-image, social roles and knowledge an individual uses in society. Lucia and Lepsinger (Kohont, 2005b) also define the competencies of the individual as one's preferential characteristics, manifesting in successful and efficient performance in the workplace. Kohont (2005b) understands individual's competencies as activation, usage, and integration of the whole of knowledge, abilities, motives, self-image, and values that allow an individual successful performance of roles, tasks, and problem-solving in complex, diverse, and unpredictable situations, both in an organisation and in society in general.

An individual's competencies include the following components:

- traits, which Musek and Pečjak (2001) define as permanent characteristics that distinguish one individual from another;
- knowledge, defined as content learned by an individual during a learning process or in the workplace;
- abilities, which Musek and Pečjak (2001) define as characteristics that most affect the individual's achievements and performance in solving various problems;
- motivation, which Robins and Langton (2003) describe as a process that determines the individual's efforts, how their efforts are directed, and how long the individual strives to achieve a goal; and
- values, which Musek (in Kohont, 2005a) defines as conceptualisations or beliefs about desired final conditions or behaviours that exceed specific situations, that direct the will, selection or assessment of conduct and concepts, and are organised considering the relative significance and self-image, which Kohont (2005a) understands as an entirety of notions and concepts formed about oneself.

Cooperation and relationships between individuals and organisations are exceptionally important in everyday life for their existence and success. Success is a goal of both individuals and organisations. Various factors affect cooperation and relationships between individuals and organisations. Among the factors affecting the relationship and cooperation of organisations with their environment, Mosley, Pietri and Megginsson (1996) include political, economic, social, technological and international factors. In their opinion, political factors indicate the influence of politics on the success of the organisation, economic factors indicate whether the organisation is growing, stagnating or regressing, social factors indicate the question of size, age, gender of population or the question of changing the attitude to specific things, the environment, safety and needs (Živkovič, 2008).

The nature of private security itself presents the need for communication which, however, quite often depends on the individual's personal competencies, as well as the competencies of an individual organisation (Löfstrand, Loftus, & Loader, 2016). During a period of circumstances changing in the global security

market, it is necessary to consider security personnel's tasks, primarily in the Anglo-American model of private security – here we encounter traditional private security and also private security for military or intelligence purposes and various other tasks within military operations – and the related competencies of an individual which must, in order to complete the said tasks, match the requirements of the tasks as much as possible. Thus, it is of prime importance to study security personnel's competencies for the further development of private security (Löfstrand et al., 2016).

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the interpersonal competencies of private security stakeholders, chiefly through the eyes of security managers and the users of security services, in the area of the competencies security personnel require when carrying out security tasks. In this paper, we wish to ascertain how the competencies of guards are assessed by security managers and security service users, and if their assessments differ. We will also analyse whether there are differences between the competencies self-assessed by security guards and the competencies assessed by their managers and the users of their services.

3 DESCRIPTION OF THE METHOD, INSTRUMENT AND SAMPLE

3.1 Description of the Questionnaire

When conducting the study, we used a questionnaire⁷ in order to obtain the assessments of security guards, security managers and security service users regarding various features of security guards' work. The data used in the analysis were obtained within the framework of a wider study on non-governmental supervisory bodies. The analysis uses 60 statements that are divided into four substantive sets related to the work of security guards. Thus, the first 14 items fall in the set of interpersonal competencies, 9 in the set of satisfaction with work conditions and salary, 11 in the set of characteristics of employee education and training, and 21 in the set of management style based on an orientation to tasks and relationships. The participants evaluated each item using a Likert-type, five-point scale, where 1 meant the statement "is not at all true" and 5 that the statement "is completely true". We used three different forms of the questionnaire in the study depending on the status of the participant, specifically for security guards, security managers, and the users of security services. The questions were identical in all forms, only the necessary instructions and form of the introductory address differed. Each questionnaire also contains a part about the participants' socio-demographic data, which includes their gender, age, education and marital status.

3.2 Study Procedure Description

In the empirical part of the study, we used the described questionnaires with the selected sample of participants, who were chosen via security companies where

⁷ *The questionnaire was developed to meet the needs of a wider study on the competencies of employees in the private security sector in the context of research on non-state security (Dvojmoč, 2013).*

they are employed or whose services they use. The participants thus come from eight different security companies which vary in terms of size, specifically: two are large, four are medium, and two are small companies⁸. Participants received the questionnaire at the workplace (primarily for the groups of security guards and managers). They followed the attached instructions and filled out the questionnaires. The questionnaires were completed without any issues or need for additional explanations; participation was voluntary and anonymised⁹.

We collected the study results contained in the questionnaires and analysed them based on our interest. Within the substantive set of the questionnaire, we primarily focused on calculating the descriptive statistics of all results and the significant differences between the groups of participants, considering their status.

3.3 Sample Description

The study included a total of 471 participants – 378 males and 93 females. For the purpose of our work, the sample was divided into three groups, namely: security guards ($n = 234$), security managers¹⁰ ($n = 32$), and users of security services¹¹ ($n = 205$). The educational structure of the study participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1:
Educational structure of the sample by groups

Group	Level of education							Total
	Primary school	Secondary school	Short-cycle college	Professional college	University degree education	Master's degree	Doctorate	
Security guards	19/ 8.16%	199/ 85.40%	8/ 3.43%	6/ 2.58%	1/ 0.43%	/	/	233/100%
Security managers	2/ 6.25%	20/ 62.50%	2/ 6.25%	4/ 12.5%	4/ 12.5%	/	/	32/100%
Users of security services	12/ 5.85%	55/ 26.83%	36/ 17.56%	34/ 16.59%	55/ 26.83%	9/ 4.39%	4/ 1.95%	205/100%

4 RESULTS

In the study, the questionnaire was administered to three groups of participants, specifically security guards, security managers, and the users of security services. Questions referred to various substantive sets on whose basis we also present the participants' answers, arranged by status.

8 Companies are divided according to the number of security staff employed: over 300 employees – large company, between 100 and 300 employees – medium company, and under 100 employees – a small company.

9 Together with the questionnaire, participants received an envelope with a stamp and written address to which they returned the completed questionnaire so they were not subjected to social pressure.

10 Eight of the security managers are licensed security managers, 24 of them, while performing tasks similar to those of the security manager are without the necessary education and further training, are operational managers who actually carry out all the functions of a security manager, which in terms of the legality of operations raises a special question.

11 We sent out 806 questionnaires, of which 407 were sent to security guards and we received 234 replies, 63 were sent to security managers and we received 32, while the remaining 367 were sent to the users of security services and we received 205 replies.

Participants first answered questions on the interpersonal competencies of security company employees. The groups of security guards and security managers provided self-evaluations, i.e. opinions about their own interpersonal competencies, while the users of security services evaluated the competencies of the other two groups.

Statement	Group of participants					
	Security guards		Security managers		Users of security services	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
I perform my work professionally.	4.48	0.63	4.50	0.57	3.86	0.92
I perform my work expertly.	4.49	0.65	4.31	0.59	3.74	0.95
I am approachable.	4.53	0.71	4.69	0.47	4.00	0.95
I am communicative.	4.50	0.69	4.62	0.55	4.01	0.88
I am polite.	4.65	0.57	4.28	0.77	4.02	0.88
I am fair.	4.79	0.46	4.81	0.47	4.01	0.94
I am hard-working.	4.68	0.56	4.72	0.52	3.90	0.90
I am adaptable.	4.54	0.66	4.44	0.67	3.81	0.88
I am intelligent.	4.34	0.69	4.21	0.71	3.64	0.98
I am considerate.	4.52	0.61	4.28	0.73	3.83	0.91
I am willing to help.	4.67	0.53	4.72	0.46	4.02	0.88
I respond quickly.	4.57	0.59	4.66	0.48	3.92	1.01
I am tidy.	4.69	0.53	4.56	0.67	4.10	0.90
I am compassionate.	4.64	0.58	4.53	0.56	3.93	0.89

Table 2:
Descriptive statistics for all participants' answers to statements on interpersonal competencies

Notes: M stands for the arithmetic mean of answers on the Likert-type, five-point scales, and SD for standard deviation.

Table 2 shows the arithmetic means and standard deviations of all participant groups' answers to the listed statements on interpersonal competencies at work. The responses indicate high values, as confirmed by the presence of the listed competencies in the participants, considering their self-assessment. After reviewing the values, we also find that the evaluations made by the users of security services for all statements are lower than the evaluations given by the other two participant groups. There are no noteworthy differences between the statements.

In the framework of the question set on interpersonal competencies, we were also interested in any significant differences between participant groups based on their status, which we tested using a one-way ANOVA.

Competences of Security Guards in Slovenia as Assessed by Users and Security Managers

Table 3:
ANOVA results
for statements
on participants'
interpersonal
competencies

Statement		SS	df	MS	F	p
I perform my work professionally.	Between groups	44.90	2	22.45	38.35	0.00
	Within groups	275.11	470	0.58		
	Total	320.00	472			
I perform my work expertly.	Between groups	61.75	2	30.88	49.59	0.00
	Within groups	292.67	470	0.62		
	Total	354.42	472			
I am approachable.	Between groups	36.09	2	18.04	27.39	0.00
	Within groups	309.60	470	0.66		
	Total	345.69	472			
I am communicative.	Between groups	29.92	2	14.96	24.98	0.00
	Within groups	281.45	470	0.60		
	Total	311.37	472			
I am polite.	Between groups	44.14	2	22.07	40.53	0.00
	Within groups	255.90	470	0.54		
	Total	300.04	472			
I am fair.	Between groups	70.70	2	35.35	70.21	0.00
	Within groups	236.66	470	0.50		
	Total	307.36	472			
I am hard-working.	Between groups	71.45	2	35.73	67.25	0.00
	Within groups	249.68	470	0.53		
	Total	321.14	472			
I am adaptable.	Between groups	60.54	2	30.27	51.92	0.00
	Within groups	274.03	470	0.58		
	Total	334.57	472			
I am intelligent.	Between groups	54.23	2	27.11	39.17	0.00
	Within groups	325.35	470	0.69		
	Total	379.59	472			
I am considerate.	Between groups	53.3	2	26.68	46.04	0.00
	Within groups	272.341	470	0.58		
	Total	325.70	472			
I am willing to help.	Between groups	53.26	2	26.63	54.19	0.00
	Within groups	230.99	470	0.49		
	Total	284.25	472			
I respond quickly.	Between groups	50.82	2	25.41	40.12	0.00
	Within groups	297.74	470	0.63		
	Total	348.56	472			
I am tidy.	Between groups	38.71	2	19.36	37.17	0.00
	Within groups	244.72	470	0.52		
	Total	283.43	472			
I am compassionate.	Between groups	56.46	2	28.23	52.78	0.00
	Within groups	251.40	470	0.53		
	Total	307.86	472			

Notes: SS stands for the sum of squares, df for degrees of freedom, MS for the mean square, F for F-test statistic, and p for the statistical significance of ANOVA, which was performed at a risk of 0.05.

The analysis of variance between all participant groups, listed in Table 3, shows that the differences in answers to all statements about interpersonal competencies are statistically significant. Participants' answers therefore significantly differed only based on whether they assessed their own competencies (security guards and security managers) or the competencies of employees from the perspective of the users of security services. Using Dunnett's C test, we analysed which groups have statistically significant differences; the results are presented in Table 4 below.

Statement	Status of participants		Difference M between groups	SE	95% IZ	
					Lower limit	Upper limit
I perform my work professionally.	security guard	security manager	-0.017	0.11	-0.28	0.25
		user of services	0.62*	0.08	0.44	0.80
	security manager	security guard	0.02	0.11	-0.25	0.28
		user of services	0.64*	0.12	0.35	0.93
	user of services	security guard	-0.62*	0.08	-0.80	-0.44
		security manager	-0.64*	0.12	-0.93	-0.35
I perform my work expertly.	security guard	security manager	0.18	0.11	-0.10	0.46
		user of services	0.74*	0.08	0.56	0.93
	security manager	security guard	-0.18	0.11	-0.46	0.10
		user of services	0.57*	0.12	0.26	0.87
	user of services	security guard	-0.74*	0.08	-0.93	-0.56
		security manager	-0.57*	0.12	-0.87	-0.26
I am approachable.	security guard	security manager	-0.15	0.10	-0.39	0.08
		user of services	0.53*	0.08	0.34	0.72
	security manager	security guard	0.15	0.10	-0.08	0.39
		user of services	0.69*	0.11	0.43	0.95
	user of services	security guard	-0.53*	0.08	-0.72	-0.34
		security manager	-0.69*	0.11	-0.95	-0.43
I am communicative.	security guard	security manager	-0.12	0.11	-0.38	0.14
		user of services	0.49*	0.08	0.31	0.67
	security manager	security guard	0.12	0.11	-0.14	0.38
		user of services	0.61*	0.12	0.33	0.89
	user of services	security guard	-0.49*	0.08	-0.67	-0.31
		security manager	-0.61*	0.12	-0.89	-0.33
I am polite.	security guard	security manager	0.37*	0.14	0.02	0.72
		user of services	0.63*	0.07	0.46	0.80
	security manager	security guard	-0.37*	0.14	-0.72	-0.02
		user of services	0.26	0.15	-0.10	0.63
	user of services	security guard	-0.63*	0.07	-0.80	-0.46
		security manager	-0.26	0.15	-0.63	0.10
I am fair.	security guard	security manager	-0.02	0.09	-0.24	0.20
		user of services	0.78*	0.07	0.61	0.95
	security manager	security guard	0.02	0.09	-0.20	0.24
		user of services	0.80*	0.11	0.54	1.05
	user of services	security guard	-0.78*	0.07	-0.95	-0.61
		security manager	-0.80*	0.11	-1.05	-0.54

Table 4:
Statistically significant differences between groups identified using Dunnett's C test

Competences of Security Guards in Slovenia as Assessed by Users and Security Managers

Table 4:
Continuation

Statement	Status of participants		Difference M between groups	SE	95% IZ	
					Lower limit	Upper limit
I am hard-working.	security guard	security manager	-0.04	0.10	-0.28	0.21
		user of services	0.78*	0.07	0.61	0.95
	security manager	security guard	0.04	0.10	-0.21	0.28
		user of services	0.82*	0.11	0.54	1.09
	user of services	security guard	-0.78*	0.07	-0.95	-0.61
		security manager	-0.82*	0.11	-1.09	-0.54
I am adaptable.	security guard	security manager	0.10	0.13	-0.20	0.41
		user of services	0.73*	0.07	0.56	0.91
	security manager	security guard	-0.10	0.13	-0.41	0.20
		user of services	0.63*	0.13	0.30	0.95
	user of services	security guard	-0.73*	0.07	-0.91	-0.56
		security manager	-0.63*	0.13	-0.95	-0.30
I am intelligent.	security guard	security manager	0.12	0.13	-0.21	0.45
		user of services	0.69*	0.08	0.50	0.89
	security manager	security guard	-0.12	0.13	-0.45	0.21
		user of services	0.57*	0.14	0.23	0.92
	user of services	security guard	-0.69*	0.08	-0.89	-0.50
		security manager	-0.57*	0.14	-0.92	-0.23
I am considerate.	security guard	security manager	0.24	0.13	-0.09	0.57
		user of services	0.70*	0.07	0.52	0.87
	security manager	security guard	-0.24	0.13	-0.57	0.09
		user of services	0.45*	0.14	0.10	0.80
	user of services	security guard	-0.70*	0.07	-0.87	-0.52
		security manager	-0.45*	0.14	-0.80	-0.10
I am willing to help.	security guard	security manager	-0.02	0.09	-0.23	0.20
		user of services	0.67*	0.07	0.51	0.84
	security manager	security guard	0.02	0.09	-0.20	0.23
		user of services	0.69*	0.10	0.45	0.94
	user of services	security guard	-0.67*	0.07	-0.84	-0.51
		security manager	-0.69*	0.10	-0.94	-0.45
I respond quickly.	security guard	security manager	-0.08	0.09	-0.31	0.14
		user of services	0.65*	0.08	0.46	0.84
	security manager	security guard	0.08	0.09	-0.14	0.31
		user of services	0.73*	0.11	0.47	1.00
	user of services	security guard	-0.65*	0.08	-0.84	-0.46
		security manager	-0.73*	0.11	-1.00	-0.47
I am tidy.	security guard	security manager	0.12	0.12	-0.18	0.43
		user of services	0.59*	0.07	0.42	0.76
	security manager	security guard	-0.12	0.12	-0.43	0.18
		user of services	0.46*	0.13	0.14	0.79
	user of services	security guard	-0.59*	0.07	-0.76	-0.42
		security manager	-0.46*	0.13	-0.79	-0.14
I am compassionate.	security guard	security manager	0.11	0.11	-0.15	0.37
		user of services	0.71*	0.07	0.54	0.88
	security manager	security guard	-0.11	0.11	-0.37	0.15
		user of services	0.60*	0.12	0.31	0.89
	user of services	security guard	-0.71*	0.07	-0.88	-0.54
		security manager	-0.60*	0.12	-0.89	-0.31

* statistically significant differences

Based on the results shown in Table 4, we can determine differences between arithmetic means in answers of different participant groups to statements on interpersonal competencies. We can conclude there are no major differences between the groups of participants when evaluating their own competencies, i.e. security guards and security managers. The trend of differences is mostly apparent between self-evaluations of one's own competencies and the evaluations of security guards' competencies made by the users of security services.

In all statements, except the statement "I am polite", differences between the security guards and security managers groups are not statistically significant. Both groups therefore evaluate their own interpersonal competencies similarly. Only the difference for the statement "I am polite" turned out to be statistically significant between the participant groups, with the security guards evaluating themselves higher than the security managers. In total, self-evaluations of the interpersonal competencies of security guards in the workplace are therefore similar, regardless of whether they hold a management position or not. Compared to the group of security guards, managers evaluate their politeness in the workplace somewhat higher. Statistically significant differences between the group of security service users and the group of security guards were apparent for all statements. As a rule, the users of security services evaluated all of the listed competencies lower than the security guards.

The same pattern is revealed when comparing the group of users of security services and the group of security managers, where statistically significant differences are apparent for all statements, except the statement "I am polite" where both groups' assessments were similar. For all the other statements, security service users assessed the competencies of security managers lower than they assessed them themselves.

5 CONCLUSION

The findings herein can hardly be compared with any other study conducted so far as none of them talked about the competence of private security guards, mostly about the relations between the police and private security, with the only similar study conducted by Meško (1999) showing that at the end of the twentieth century police officers and private security guards were more competitors than collaborators.

Examining the study results allows one to conclude that the differences are indeed perceived; however, statistically significant differences are mainly reflected in the security managers' view of the guards, which we regard as meaning that security managers view of the competencies of their employees are not evaluated equally highly as by themselves. In the future, it would therefore be worth exploring security managers' competencies regarding management skills.

Accordingly, the findings can help security managers and executives of security companies in decision-making, when communicating with employees or the users of their services, in human resources management, in managing interpersonal relationships etc. The difference between good and bad managers is first detected by their subordinates. With its findings, this article contributes

to a better understanding of the security guard profession, allowing managers to reflect on themselves and start managing the company and the employees, and not to – as is often the case in private security – issue orders. In addition to the above, this article is the first to discuss interpersonal competencies in private security given that the general consensus seems to be that practically anyone can be a security guard.

Lokovšek (2015) found that police officers do not have sufficient knowledge about the work and tasks of private security guards, or the necessary competencies for their work.

Nowadays, when the labour market is quite saturated but it is harder to assess workers' competencies, security companies can implement a competencies assessment model in their business to improve their personnel primarily by adhering to the following steps:

- checking if their employees are even suitable for the work they are performing;
- checking if their employees assess them as being sufficiently competent to lead and appoint tasks and thus, if necessary, to change their own management style;
- checking what their employees think about the users of security services;
- based on an analysis, to remove employees who are unsuitable in terms of their personality for the job of a security guard; and
- during recruitment, by considering the individual's competencies as one of the criteria of the job interview.

We may therefore conclude that it is extremely important for the work of security personnel to be performed by persons holding suitable interpersonal competencies for such work; otherwise, the work is performed poorly or, in the worst case, causes conflicts within an organisation, as well as with the users of the security company's services, thereby weakening the reputation of the both profession and the organisation employing the individuals, which also poses a significant challenge for management in private security companies.

We also see numerous options for the development of private security activities chiefly in integration with other activities and organisations, from telecommunications operators and insurance companies to the banking sector and in integral corporate security.

REFERENCES

- Bocklet, R. (1990). Police-private security relationship. *Law and Order*, 38, 54–59.
- Bohlander, G., & Snell, A. (2004). *Managing human resources* (13th ed.). Manson: South-Western Publishing.
- Bratton, J., & Gold, J. (2003). *Human resource management: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Houndmills; Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Companies Act [Zakon o podjetjih]. (1988, 1989, 1990). *Uradni list SFRJ*, (77/88, 40/89, 46/90, 61/90)

- Cunningham, W., & Taylor, T. H. (1985). *The Hallcrest report I: Private security and police in America*. Stoneham: Butterworths-Heinemann.
- Čas, T. (1999). Zasebna varnost in zasebno varstvo kot sestavini nacionalne varnosti in nacionalnovarnostnega sistema Republike Slovenije [Private security and personal protection as a component of national security and the national security system of the Republic of Slovenia]. In A. Anžič (Ed.), *Nove možnosti zasebnega varstva v Sloveniji* (pp. 21–25). Ljubljana: Visoka policijsko-varnostna šola.
- Dvojmoč, M. (2013). *Ne državno institucionalno zagotavljanje varnosti ter občinska redarstva v Republiki Sloveniji* (Doktorska disertacija) [Non-state institutional ensuring the safety and municipal officers in Slovenia (Doctoral dissertation)]. Nova Gorica: Evropska pravna fakulteta.
- Hansen Löfstrand, C., Loftus, B., & Loader, I. (2016). Doing 'dirty work': Stigma and esteem in the private security industry. *European Journal of Criminology*, 13(3), 297–314.
- Kohont, A. (2005a). *Kompetenčni profil slovenskih strokovnjakov za upravljanje človeških virov* (Magistrsko delo) [Competence profile of Slovenian experts in human resource management (Master thesis)]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Kohont, A. (2005b). Razvrščanje kompetenc [Classification of competencies]. In M. S. Pezdirc (Ed.), *Kompetence v kadrovski praksi* (pp. 30–48). Ljubljana: GV Izobraževanje.
- Lokovšek, D. (2015). Problematika ukrepanja policije v okviru Zakona o zasebnem varovanju [The issue of police action under the Private Security Act]. In *Učinkovitost državne regulative v panogi zasebnega varovanja* (pp. 60–64). Ljubljana: Zbornica za razvoj slovenskega zasebnega varovanja.
- Meško, G. (1999). Policisti in varnostniki – sodelavci ali tekmeči? [Police officers and security guards – colleagues or competitors?] In A. Anžič (Ed.), *Nove možnosti zasebnega varstva v Sloveniji* (pp. 203–217). Ljubljana: Visoka policijsko-varnostna šola.
- Meško, G., Nalla, M. K., & Sotlar, A. (2004). Youth perceptions of private security in Slovenia: Preliminary findings. In G. Meško, M. Pagon, & B. Dobovšek (Eds.), *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of contemporary criminal justice* (pp. 745–752). Ljubljana: Faculty of Criminal Justice.
- Meško, G., Nalla, M. K., & Sotlar, A. (2005). Policisti in zasebni varnostniki – veliki in mali bratje [Police and private security officers – big and little brothers]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 56(2), 147–162.
- Meško, G., Sotlar, A., Lobnikar, B., Jere, M., & Tominc, B. (2012). *Občutek ogroženosti in vloga policije pri zagotavljanju varnosti na lokalni ravni* [Perceptions of threats and the role of police in ensuring security at the local level]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede.
- Modic, M., Lobnikar, B., & Dvojmoč, M. (2014). Policijska dejavnost v Sloveniji: analiza procesov transformacije, pluralizacije in privatizacije [Policing in Slovenia: An analysis of the processes of transformation, pluralization, and privatization]. *Varstvoslovje*, 16(3), 217–241.
- Mosley, C. D., Pietri, H. P., & Megginsson, C. L. (1996). *Management – leadership in action* (5th ed.). New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Musek, J., & Pečjak, V. (2001). *Psihologija* [Psychology]. Ljubljana: Educy.

- Nalla, M., & Newman, G. (1990). *A primer in private security*. Albany: Harrow and Heston.
- Perrenoud, P. (1997). *Construire des competences des l'ecole* [Building competences of the school]. Pratiques et enjeux pedagogiques. Paris: ESF.
- Ponsears, P. (2001). Reading about »community (oriented) policing« and police models. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 24(4), 470–496.
- Private Security and Obligatory Organization of Security Services Act [Zakon o zasebnem varovanju in obveznem organiziranju službe varovanja]. (1994, 1997). *Uradni list RS*, (32/94, 23/97).
- Private Security Act [Zakon o zasebnem varovanju]. (2003, 2007, 2009, 2011). *Uradni list RS*, (126/03, 102/07, 41/09, 17/11).
- Private Security Act [Zakon o zasebnem varovanju]. (2011). *Uradni list RS*, (17/11).
- Robbins, P. S., & Langton, N. (2003). *Organizational behaviour: Concepts, controversies, applications*. Toronto: Pearson Education.
- Rozman, B. (2005). Upravljanje kompetenc v družbi Merkur [Management skills in company Merkur]. In M. S. Pezdirc (Ed.), *Kompetence v kadrovski praksi* (pp. 127–152). Ljubljana: GV Izobraževanje.
- Slak, B. (2014). *Deregulacija področja zasebnega varovanja – med potrebo in možnostjo* [Deregulation of the private security sector – between the needs and the possibilities]. Paper presented at the Conference: "Private security 2014", Zagreb, 27. 11. 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.hcz.hr/UserDocsImages/KONFERENCIJA%20PRIVATNA%20ZASTITA%202014/BSLAK-ZRSZV-HCZ-2014.pdf>
- Sotlar, A. (2007). Izvor legitimnosti zasebnega varovanja: dobiček med zasebnim in javnim interesom? [The Origin of the Legitimacy of Private Security: Earnings between Private and Public Interests]. In *IV. mednarodna konferenca, VIII. strokovni posvet Dnevi zasebnega varovanja* (pp. 13–25). Ljubljana: Zbornica Republike Slovenije za zasebno varovanje.
- Sotlar, A., & Čas, T. (2011). Analiza dosedanjega razvoja zasebnega varovanja v Sloveniji – med prakso, teorijo in empirijo [Analysis of the current development of private security in Slovenia between practice, theory and empirical experience]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 62(3), 227–241.
- Sotlar, A., & Dvojmoč, M. (2016). Private security in Slovenia: 25 years of experiences and challenges for the future. In B. Vankovska, & O. Bakreski (Eds.), *International Scientific Conference Private Security in the 21st Century* (pp. 15–39). Skopje: Chamber of Republic of Macedonia for Private Security.
- Sotlar, A., Dvojmoč, M., & Tominc, B. (2016). Zasebno varovanje kot nadzorovalec privatiziranih urbanih prostorov: študija primera nakupovalnega središča v Sloveniji [Private Security as a Supervisor of Privatized Urban Spaces: A case study of a shopping mall in Slovenia]. *Varstvoslovje*, 17(1), 49–64.
- Stewart, J. K. (1985). Public safety and private police. *Public Administration Review*, 45(Spec. Iss.), 758–765.
- Svetlik, I. (2005). *O kompetencah* [About the competence]. Ljubljana: GV Izobraževanje.

Walsh, W. in Donovan, E. (1989). Private security and community policing: Evaluation and comment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 17(3), 187–197.

Živković, J. (2008). *Pomen interpersonalnih kompetenc za sodelovanje v timu* (Diplomsko delo) [The importance of interpersonal competencies to participate in the team (Final thesis)]. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

About the Author:

Miha Dvojmoč, Ph.D., Lecturer at the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: miha.dvojmoč@fvv.uni-mb.si