

**An Evaluation of the
Queensland Security Providers Act
Implications for National Regulation**

Report to

The Criminology Research Council
Commonwealth Attorney General's Department

Tim Prenzler, Hennessey Hayes, Richard Wortley

School of Justice Administration, Griffith University, Brisbane

April 1998

Contents

Acknowledgments	1
Summary	2
Executive Summary	3
The New Generation Security Legislation	5
Research Method	7
Results	8
Impact of the Act	9
Scope of Licensing	10
Training	12
Background Checks	13
Process Aspects of the Act's Development and Administration	14
Written Responses	16
Discussion and Implications	17
Impact of the Act	17
Scope of Licensing	18
Training	18
Background Checks	20
Process Aspects of the Act's Development and Administration	20
Developments in Other States	21
Lessons for Research	22
Summary of Recommendations	23
References	25
Appendix 1: Generic Questionnaire	28
Appendix 2: Written Responses	30

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank the Criminology Research Council for their interest in this project and financial support. We believe this is an important study, unique in Australia, which can make a significant contribution to the professionalisation of the security industry through enhanced co-operation with government in sensible and workable regulation. The beneficiaries will be the general public, commercial consumers of the crime prevention and safety services provided by the Australian security industry, as well as security employees and companies committed to high standards of service.

We are grateful to all the security managers and police who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and return it, and to those who included comments, added pages with more detailed comments, or made phone calls to follow up on their responses.

Thanks to Senior Sergeant Lloyd Taylor and Superintendent Ian Stewart of the Queensland Police Service for providing a list of police knowledgeable in the area of the security industry.

Thanks to Rick Draper, Jim Llewellyn, Chas Morris, Richard Maguire and Peter Grabosky, who provided comments on the draft questionnaire. Rick Draper and Richard Maguire also provided feedback on a draft of the report.

Thanks also to Ross Homel, Peter Grabosky and one anonymous reviewer for their positive comments to the CRC on the proposed study.

Ross Homel must again be thanked, with Tamara Burrows, for the data on crowd controller behaviours from the North Queensland Community Safety Action Projects.

We are particularly grateful to our Research Officer, Carol Ronken, who stuck with the project through the highs and lows, and whose polite but determined pursuit of respondents led to a good result in an area traditionally difficult to research.

Tim Prenzler
Hennessey Hayes
Richard Wortley.

Contact author: Dr Tim Prenzler
School of Justice Administration
Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus, Brisbane, 4111
Ph: (07) 3875 5613,
Fax: (07) 3875 5608
E-mail: T.Prenzler@gu.edu.au

This is a project supported by a grant from the Criminology Research Council. The views expressed are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Council.

Summary

A survey of a large sample of security managers revealed scepticism about the success of the Queensland *Security Providers Act* in reducing misconduct in the security industry. Respondents felt the licensing system was too restricted and enforcement was too weak to professionalise the industry to the desired standard; although there was some support for improved entry-level competency standards as a result of minimum training requirements. There was strong support for a range of reform measures. Respondents wanted comprehensive licensing of all industry sectors linked to a national system, improved training and assessment, frequent criminal history checks on licensees, more vigorous compliance monitoring, and compulsory insurance and monitoring of firms for award payments. National co-ordination of the states and territories and the security industry is needed to achieve these goals.

Executive Summary

This report follows a grant from the Criminology Research Council in 1997 to survey security managers for their views on the impact of the Queensland *Security Providers Act 1993* and Regulations of 1995. Opinions were also sought as to benefits or deficiencies in the Act, and possible amendments to improve professionalism and accountability.

The survey does not assume security managers are the ultimate source of wisdom regarding the best form of industry regulation, but it values the opinions of managers as insiders and informed practitioners with both a financial and personal professional stake in best practice. Responses should therefore be treated as informative and also indicative of the response of the industry to legislative reform.

The *Queensland Security Providers Act* is typical of new developments in security legislation in Australia and other parts of the world and provides a useful test case of expanded licensing and control with lessons for future developments in regulation.

The survey was sent to a large sample of all industry sectors covering all telephone listed companies in the state capital Brisbane and two major regional centres. The response rate was 30%. This is amongst the best return rates for survey research of security practitioners.

Respondents were divided about the impact of the legislation. The tendency was towards the view the Act had failed to remove disreputable persons and 'a criminal element' from the industry. Opinions were almost equally divided over reducing harmful behaviours such as assaults by crowd controllers, and improving skill levels of security operatives. There were fairly high levels of uncertainty.

A number of suggested changes received firm support with significance for an expanded national approach to regulation. Respondents were strongly supportive of licensing of all industry categories beyond those currently covered (crowd controllers, guards, private investigators and companies). Support for licensing extended to security system installers and repairers, public and private in-house security, security consultants, control room operators and security firm representatives.

There was also strong support for the following additions to legislative provisions.

1. Licensing should be national to allow for consistency, interstate portability of licences and nationwide criminal history and other checks.
2. Criminal history checks should be conducted prior to entry to a training course.
3. Criminal history checks should be conducted at frequent intervals on current licence holders.
4. More attention needs to be given to monitoring compliance with legislation.
5. Monitoring should include compliance with industrial awards.
6. Security firm licence provisions must include compulsory insurance.

There was less certainty about the effectiveness of mandated training standards. While there appeared to be support for the content of current courses, about half of all respondents indicated the time periods of between 24 and 38 hours were insufficient. Approximately one third supported the time periods. This report argues for longer training periods on the basis of other studies. Much more attention in training needs to be given to legal rights and responsibilities, communication and conflict resolution, and physical restraint and self defence skills. Assessment and certification standards need to be more stringent, and are appropriately controlled by vocational training departments with security industry input.

There was little support for the Office of Consumer Affairs as the regulating body; although this appeared to be based on experience, not principle. There was no agreement on police or any other government agency. The report argues the role of police is not appropriately extended to industry regulation other than firearms licensing and registration. Outside police, the location of the primary regulating body is less important than its approach, which needs to be dedicated and proactive both in terms of enforcement and leadership in industry professionalisation.

To aid in the adoption of these recommendations the security industry needs to find a means of overcoming its fragmentation to establish a single national body representing all the separate trade, industrial and state bodies. This is essential to effectively lobby the Commonwealth Government to co-ordinate development of a model Act and regulations, to give the model legislation legitimacy, and to achieve endorsement by the states and territories.

A full list of the recommendations of this report are set out in point form at page 23.

The New Generation Security Legislation

In 1993 Queensland introduced new legislation to regulate the security industry. The *Security Providers Act* was based on the *Private Agents (Amendment) Act 1990* developed in Victoria. Both Acts can be seen as the vanguard of a new generation of security legislation in Australia aimed at improving the conduct and competence of security providers through tougher licensing requirements including criminal history checks and mandated training. In both cases, the development of legislation was triggered by community alarm over an extremely serious escalating problem with assaults by crowd controllers ('bouncers' or 'patron protectors') (VCCAV 1990). Expanded control of other sectors of the security industry was an addition to the main task of regulating crowd controllers. Parliamentary support for the Queensland Act was partly influenced by recognition of the fact security services were increasingly taking over police functions in areas such as maintaining public order. The concern with crowd controllers is evidenced in the legislation where 'crowd controller' is the only licence category including both in-house and contract security providers.

The development, content and administration of the *Security Providers Act* have been criticised in a qualitative study using interviews with key stakeholders and documentary sources. Prenzler, Baxter and Draper (1998) argued the new Act was an important step forward but a number of deficiencies marred its capacity to professionalise the industry to the required level. One major problem was the exclusion of in-house security (excepting crowd controllers) and other security categories such as consultants, control room operators, and security system installers and locksmiths. Other problems (inclusive of crowd controllers) included minimalist training standards. These were in limbo for two years and eventually were set at 24 hours (i.e., three days) for crowd controllers, 35 hours for private investigators and 38 hours for security officers. The evaluation showed a cross-section of interviewees was sceptical about the quality and content of instruction, and about proper conduct of examinations. It was also argued that more attention in training needed to be given to the need for crowd controllers, not just to abstain from aggressive behaviour, but to take greater responsibility and show more initiative in protecting patrons from other patrons. (Crowd Controllers and Security Officers must have a first aid certificate.) In 1995, regulation of training was devolved from the body responsible for administering the Act - the Office of Consumer Affairs - to the state's vocational accreditation body *Training Queensland*. Trainers are not required to hold a licence but must obtain approval based on evidence of instructional skills and content knowledge.

Another alleged deficiency in the regulatory process is that a criminal history check is done only at the time of application for a licence. Applicants for annual renewal are required to declare they had not committed an exclusionary offence in the preceding year. In neighbouring New South Wales checks were performed daily (NSWPS 1995). In Queensland, licence applicants must also supply testimonials from three 'reputable' persons and this was seen as subjective and unreliable. There had also been criticism by the Queensland Security Association (QSA) that there were loopholes in the Act, for example that unlicensed crowd controllers could be employed as bar staff. A Security Industry Representative Committee (SIRC1) had contributed to the development of the legislation but co-operation with the government broke down. There were divisions between industry bodies, and complaints from the industry of inadequate consultation and of failure to initiate a national set of standards which would allow for uniformity and inter-state portability of licences. The Australian Security Industry Association Limited (ASIAL) pressed for auditing of employers for compliance with industrial awards because of concern over payment of under-award wages and consequential reduced quality in personnel. These suggestions were largely ignored.

A major criticism in Prenzler et al's (1998) study was that there were no provisions for evaluating the impact of the Act. This has also been a feature of the Victorian legislation. The researchers were told it would be impossible to identify court records of assaults by crowd controllers before and after the Act. In any case, prosecutions would show only the tip of the problem. One option for evaluation, focused on crowd controllers, was being developed in the Queensland *Community Safety Action Projects*. These were violence reduction projects centred on major tourist centres. The projects were community-based responses to the same problems of disorder around nightclubs that led to the *Security Providers Act*. In the first project in Surfers Paradise, the introduction of a code of practice

for responsible serving practices in nightclubs was evaluated through observational studies. Significant improvements in the behaviour of crowd controllers were noted. However, these were not directly linked to the implementation of the new legislation, and the effects of the legislation would be difficult to disentangle from the interventions specific to the project (see Homel, Hauritz, Wortley, McIlwain and Carvolth 1997).

It was also argued that enforcement and compliance monitoring methods were inadequate - largely limited to public complaints and occasional spotchecks on crowd controllers. Consumer Affairs was not even able to supply data on licence applications, rejections, complaints, disqualifications or fines and prosecutions.

The problems of abuse of position and failure of duty by crowd controllers and managers of licensed premises have been addressed at various levels in Australia from the late-1980s. Since then there have also been a series of inquiries and investigations into other elements of the security industry and research undertaken into training needs. Some of the problems exposed by these inquiries are summarised below (see Prenzler 1998).

- Fraudulent misrepresentation of security patrol services.
- Fraudulent misrepresentation of alarm monitoring services.
- Corruption between private investigators and public officials trading in confidential information.
- Corrupt dealings between police and security repair firms.
- Massive waste of police resources responding to false alarms.
- Shoot outs between armed robbers and cash-in-transit personnel involving death, injury and serious threats to public safety.
- Under-award payments to security employees.
- Criminal infiltration of the industry.
- Substandard training in a range of crucial competencies including firearms and people management skills.

Recognition of the need to ensure higher competency standards has been reflected in part in action begun in 1996 when the Commonwealth took the initiative through Property Services Training Australia and established a Security Industry Advisory Board (Hume 1996). This was done in part to address the principle of interstate portability of licenses under the federal *Mutual Recognition Act 1993*. Consumer Affairs has observer status on the Queensland Security Industry Training Advisory Committee (SITAC), responding to the federal initiative. Agreement has been reached between the states and Commonwealth on standards for some security operative categories, but progress has been extremely slow.

The most determined responses to the problems outlined above have been in Western Australia, where the government introduced the *Security and Related Activities (Control) Act 1996*, and New South Wales, with the *Security Industry Act 1997*. Both Acts include comprehensive licensing and pre-employment training for operatives, and reflect the inadequacy of alternative regulatory approaches including de-regulation and self-regulation, civil remedies, and minimalist licensing of parts of the industry (see Sarre 1998). The New South Wales legislation includes some of the measures proposed but rejected during the drafting of the Queensland Act such as compliance with industrial awards and insurance cover (Adams 1997). The Queensland evaluation relates directly to some of the major elements of the NSW and WA legislation.

Research Method

The study reported on here was designed as a quantitative test of the assessment made in the qualitative study by Prenzler et al. (1998) described above. As noted, hard data about the impact of the *Security Providers Act* is difficult to obtain. A survey that focuses on owners and managers could be said to merely reflect corporate bias against regulation that imposes costs and limitations on commercial freedom. However, the opinions provided are those of senior practitioners with a vested interest in an industry with a good public image, and previous studies of security managers have shown strong support for regulation (Cunningham, Strauchs and van Meter 1990; Prenzler 1995).

Given that the major focus of the legislation was on crowd controllers, it was decided to concentrate the study on areas with the most nightclubs. These are the capital city Brisbane, the Gold Coast (immediately south of Brisbane), and Cairns in tropical north Queensland. These cities account for almost 80% of the state's population. A data base of security providers was constructed from the *Telstra Yellow Pages*. It was assumed almost all contract security providers and nightclubs need to advertise in this major medium.

An approach was made to the Queensland Police Service (QPS) following advice some police have frequent contact with security providers, especially crowd controllers, and would have useful views on the impact of the Act and possible areas for improvements. The QPS supplied a list of 10 police managers likely to have involvement with nightclubs and other elements of the security industry. A sample of in-house public sector security managers was selected from the list of local, state and federal government agencies listed in the *Telstra White Pages*. Larger agencies were selected likely to have substantial property and people to protect. Selection of in-house private sector security managers was a challenge and number of different criteria could have been employed. It was decided to restrict the sample to the large retail sector given this is traditionally a strong in-house area. Large shopping centres and department stores were selected from the *Telstra White Pages*. The addition of police and in-house security managers made for a total sample of 1,189 across seven groups. Locksmiths were included in the more specialist area of 'Security Systems and Consultants'.

The sectors were:

1. Guard and Patrol Services (includes contract crowd controller providers and cash-in-transit),
2. Security Systems and Consultants (includes locksmiths, investigators and trainers),
3. Security Hardware Services (includes door, window and equipment manufacture, installation and repair),
4. In-house Security Management (public sector),
5. In-house Security Management (private sector/major retail firms),
6. Night Club Management,
7. Police.

A mail out questionnaire was developed with the assistance of four members of security associations. A generic questionnaire is shown in Appendix I. Some questions were omitted which were not relevant to specific sectors. Consequently the sample numbers varied on different questions. A Likert style response format was used to obtain opinions regarding five main areas:

1. The impact of the Act,
2. Scope of licensing,
3. Training,
4. Background checks,
5. Process aspects of the Act's development and administration.

Response options ranged from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. Space was provided for written responses to clarify opinions and suggest improvements.

A set of items in the questionnaire asked respondents to self-identify their industry sector. While most respondents self-identified in only one category (approximately 78%), the questionnaire afforded respondents the opportunity to provide multiple identifications reflecting provision of diverse security services by the one company. Descriptive analyses are based on the entire sample of respondents. However, comparative analyses are based on industry sector identification. Because statistical tests require data based on respondents (not responses), we identified the 'multiple responders' and grouped them together. Police were excluded because there were only seven. Some references to police responses are made in the text.

Results

The first and follow up mail outs of 1,189 questionnaires resulted in 295 'returned to sender' as 'no longer at this address'. These were deleted from the data base. Twenty-seven questionnaires were returned either identifying as more than one category or with identification removed. These were counted once in the following tables reporting on grouped questions and counted for each sector in the tables showing industry sector responses per question. A total of 267 completed questionnaires was received: 30% of the final adjusted sample of 893 (Table 1). The lowest response was from security systems, locksmiths, consultants and investigators (13%). These reduced the overall response, but some good response rates were obtained; for example, 51% for guard and patrol services. The reason a better response was not achieved may relate to commercial time pressures. The best responses were from public sector in-house security managers and police (59% and 70%).

Table 1: Return Rate

Security Sector	Number distributed	No longer at address	Total sample	Number returned	Return rate
Guard and Patrol Services	92	49	43	22	51.2%
Security Systems & Consultants	585	104	481	64	13.3%
Security Hardware Services	308	115	193	74	38.3%
Nightclub Management	70	14	56	17	30.4%
In-house Security (Public)	42	5	37	22	59.4%
In-house Security (Private)	81	8	73	34	46.6%
Police	10	0	10	7	70.0%
Unknown*	-	-	-	27	-
Total	1189	295	893	267	29.9%

* A number of questionnaires were returned with their codes removed or who identified as belonging to more than one sector, making it impossible to identify a single sector category.

The majority of respondents (56%) self-identified as owning their own firm; 45% identified as chief executives, 30% as middle managers and 16% as 'a different category'. Respondents were asked the total number of staff employed. About 42% had 10 or less employees; 14% had between 11 and 50; and 8% had over 500.

The following sections report the responses for the whole sample (tables labelled 'a') and across industry sector (tables labelled 'b'). For tables based on the entire sample, the column labelled 'Agree' is based on the combined responses of 'agree' and 'strongly agree' to questionnaire items. Likewise,

the table column labelled 'Disagree' is the combined 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' responses. For industry sector comparisons, means and standard deviations were calculated on levels of agreement where 1 indicates strong agreement and 5 indicates strong disagreement. 'Unsure/don't know' was treated as the neutral category. For several sector-specific items at least one category is not applicable and is thus labelled 'NA'. Respondents were grouped by industry sectors based upon their self-identification. F-statistics were calculated to indicate where significant industry sector differences exist. Scheffe post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine where specific sector differences lie. All F-tests and post-hoc results may be obtained from the authors upon request.

Impact of the Act

Opinions on the impact of the Act were divided (Table 2a). Approximate equal thirds either felt the Act had reduced assaults by crowd controllers, had not reduced assaults, or were unsure/didn't know.

Table 2a: Opinions of the Impact of the Security Providers Act

Impact	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
Q1: The Act has reduced assaults by crowd controllers in licensed venues	37.6%	30.5%	32.1%	128
Q2: The Act has removed shonky operators from the industry	13.6%	24.4%	61.9%	205
Q3: The Act has removed a criminal element from the industry	21.2%	28.8%	50.0%	222
Q4: The security industry is more professional as a result of the Act	41.4%	21.5%	37.1%	205
Q5: The Act has made crowd controllers more effective in protecting patrons	40.6%	29.7%	29.7%	128
Q32: Very few unlicensed persons are working in areas where licences are required	21.1%	33.1%	45.8%	166

These overall results should be compared with the responses of nightclub managers (Table 2b). This group is amongst those most likely to be informed of crowd controllers' behaviour but also the group with the most to gain from the appearance of reduced assaults. The mean level of agreement expressed by nightclub managers was 2.41, the most positive of all industry sector groups. There was a similar division of opinion amongst the whole group over improvements in crowd controllers' protection of patrons. While approximately 40% of all respondents agreed with this statement, most of this agreement was accounted for by nightclub managers (mean level of agreement was 2.35). There were no substantive differences observed across the remaining sector groups.

For the security industry as a whole, 50% disagreed with the proposition the Act had removed a 'criminal element' and a large proportion (29%) were unsure or did not know; 62% thought the Act had not removed 'shonky operators'. There was a slightly higher level of support for improved professionalism, with 41% agreeing, 37% disagreeing and 21% unsure. Forty-six percent of respondents disagreed there were few unlicensed operators working without a licence; 33% was unsure. The F-tests revealed some significant differences across industry sectors. Again, nightclub managers appear to support the notion the Act has removed a criminal element from the industry. Levels of agreement among nightclub managers were significantly higher compared to Security Systems and Consultants. Respondents self-identified as In-house Security tended to be more supportive of improved professionalism compared to other industry sectors.

Police views were mixed on the impact of the Act. On the question of reducing assaults, two agreed, three disagreed and two were unsure. Six of the seven thought 'shonky operators' or a 'criminal element' had not been removed, although all seven thought the industry was more professional. Five of the seven disagreed that there were few unlicensed persons working where licences are required.

**Table 2b: Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics.
1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.**

Impact	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security Hardware	In-house Security	Nightclubs	Multiple Responders	F	df
Q1: The Act has reduced assaults by crowd controllers in licensed venues	3.20 [0.92]	3.08 [0.98]	2.81 [0.69]	NA [NA]	2.41 [1.23]	3.05 [1.17]	1.61	117
Q2: The Act has removed shonky operators from the industry	4.06 [1.24]	3.70 [1.09]	3.33 [1.14]	3.52 [1.03]	NA [NA]	4.22 [1.03]	4.61*	193
Q3: The Act has removed a criminal element from the industry	3.44 [1.15]	3.63 [1.03]	3.19 [0.96]	3.27 [0.94]	2.29 [0.99]	3.80 [1.11]	6.41*	210
Q4: The security industry is more professional as a result of the Act	3.06 [1.12]	3.65 [1.03]	3.15 [0.91]	2.64 [0.96]	NA [NA]	3.16 [1.29]	5.13*	193
Q5: The Act has made crowd controllers more effective in protecting patrons	3.3 [0.95]	3.03 [0.92]	2.92 [0.63]	NA [NA]	2.35 [0.93]	3.00 [1.21]	1.95	117
Q32: Very few unlicensed persons are working in areas where licences are required	3.31 [1.14]	3.35 [0.80]	3.30 [0.78]	NA [NA]	2.41 [0.71]	3.76 [1.22]	6.16*	154

* $p < 0.05$.

Scope of Licensing

The very large majority of respondents supported the extension of licensing to provide complete coverage of the industry. Table 3a shows support was fairly consistent at around 80% for the currently excluded categories of security system installers and repairers, in-house security, consultants, control room operators, and security representatives. Support was also very strong across all categories of respondents (Table 3b). The only item for which there appeared to be group differences was where the multiple responders supported the extension of licensing significantly more than the In-house respondents. Multiple responders have the widest coverage of security functions. The majority (82%) self-identified as Security System and Consultants along with another category. Of these 79% chose Guard and Patrol as their other affiliation. Nevertheless, the majority of respondents tended to agree that the Act should be modified to include currently excluded sectors irrespective of the respondents' sector. All seven police were of this opinion.

Table 3a: Opinions of Type and Content of Licensing

Issue	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
The following exempt categories should be licensed:				
Q7: Security system installers and repairers	86.4%	2.4%	11.2%	250
Q8: In-house security officers	79.5%	8.8%	11.6%	249
Q9: Security consultants	85.2%	5.6%	9.2%	250
Q10: Control room operators	77.5%	8.4%	14.1%	249
Q11: Security firm representatives	78.0%	6.0%	16.0%	250
Q12: A single license (based on core skills) with specialist endorsements would be a better system	54.7%	17.2%	28.1%	267

Table 3b. Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics. 1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.

Issue	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security Hardware	In-house Security	Nightclub	Multiple Responders	F	df
The following exempt categories should be licensed:								
Q7: Security system installers and repairers	1.56 [0.51]	1.77 [1.19]	2.06 [1.24]	1.63 [0.98]	NA [NA]	1.59 [1.00]	1.69	238
Q8: In-house security officers	1.75 [0.86]	2.04 [1.10]	1.98 [0.81]	2.30 [1.41]	NA [NA]	1.61 [0.94]	3.11*	237
Q9: Security consultants	1.87 [0.81]	1.84 [1.10]	1.89 [0.84]	1.82 [1.05]	NA [NA]	1.70 [1.05]	0.28	238
Q10: Control room operators	2.06 [1.12]	2.09 [1.21]	2.13 [0.93]	2.14 [1.23]	NA [NA]	1.77 [1.04]	1.07	237
Q11: Security firm representatives	2.56 [1.26]	2.14 [1.26]	2.15 [1.05]	1.94 [1.03]	NA [NA]	1.81 [1.11]	1.80	238
Q12: A single license (based on core skills) with specialist endorsements would be a better system	2.31 [1.40]	2.88 [1.45]	2.65 [1.18]	2.41 [1.28]	2.59 [1.12]	2.30 [1.44]	1.35	255

* p < 0.05.

Training

Training was an area where there was little agreement and high levels of uncertainty. Table 4a shows half felt the minimum training period of 24 hours for crowd controllers was not appropriate (i.e., too short). The percentages agreeing to the appropriateness of training periods increased with the period length: 32% agreeing to 35 hours for private investigators and 42% agreeing to 38 hours for security officers. Looking at the responses across industry sector, no significant differences arose. Police were equally divided between either viewing training periods as too short or being unsure.

On the question of firearms training, about one third each agreed training was adequate, disagreed or were unsure. A large proportion of all respondents (45%) felt attention to trainers' qualifications and course content had improved standards, although an almost equal number (42%) was unsure. Just over one third of respondents saw three specific elements of training as adequate. These were communication, conflict resolution skills and self-defence; while 43% and 46% respectively supported the adequacy of instruction in physical restraint skills and law. About half (51%) supported the adequacy of basic security procedures learnt. Opinions were fairly consistent across industry sector, and there were no significant group differences observed on firearms training and course content. (While the overall F-statistic for Q25 is significant, the post-hoc analysis showed that no two groups differed at $\alpha=0.05$). Three police thought firearms training was adequate, one disagreed and three were unsure. They tended to either be critical of specific competencies or unsure.

Table 4a: Opinions on Mandated Training

Training Element	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
Q13: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for crowd controllers (24hrs)	30.4%	19.0%	50.5%	184
Q14: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for private investigators (35hrs)	32.3%	27.2%	40.5%	195
Q15: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for security officers (38hrs)	42.4%	20.5%	37.1%	205
Q16: Firearms training for security officers under the <i>Weapons Act</i> is adequate	30.2%	37.6%	32.2%	205
Q19: Recently <i>Training Queensland</i> set clearer standards for trainers' qualifications and course content. This has improved training standards.	45.2%	42.2%	12.7%	166
Training courses teach adequate:				
Q20: communication skills	36.1%	34.9%	28.9%	166
Q21: conflict resolution skills	39.2%	33.7%	27.1%	166
Q22: physical restraint skills	43.4%	34.9%	21.7%	166
Q23: self-defence	37.3%	37.3%	25.3%	166
Q24: knowledge of law	45.8%	36.1%	18.1%	166
Q25: basic security procedures	51.2%	34.3%	14.5%	166
Q26: Trainees are properly assessed before certification	29.5%	36.1%	34.3%	166

**Table 4b. Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics.
1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.**

Training Element	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security Hardware	In-house Security	Nightclubs	Multiple Responders	F	df
Q13: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for crowd controllers (24hrs)	3.90 [1.20]	3.42 [1.27]	2.88 [0.95]	3.45 [1.33]	3.53 [1.18]	3.28 [1.34]	1.28	173
Q14: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for private investigators (35hrs)	3.45 [1.21]	3.35 [1.19]	2.96 [1.06]	3.41 [1.35]	NA [NA]	3.00 [1.21]	1.24	183
Q15: Training periods under the Act are appropriate for security officers (38hrs)	3.06 [1.34]	3.25 [1.21]	2.93 [1.00]	3.00 [1.40]	NA [NA]	2.95 [1.24]	0.42	193
Q16: Firearms training for security officers under the <i>Weapons Act</i> is adequate	3.19 [1.28]	3.30 [1.04]	2.85 [0.91]	3.07 [0.89]	NA [NA]	3.09 [1.34]	0.71	193
Q19: Recently <i>Training Queensland</i> set clearer standards for trainers' qualifications and course content. This has improved training standards.	2.94 [1.00]	2.75 [0.67]	2.56 [0.58]	NA [NA]	2.65 [0.86]	2.61 [1.10]	0.60	154
Training courses teach adequate:								
Q20: communication skills	3.25 [1.00]	2.95 [0.78]	2.52 [0.64]	NA [NA]	2.76 [1.25]	3.02 [1.11]	1.87	154
Q21: conflict resolution skills	3.13 [1.09]	2.88 [0.76]	2.63 [0.63]	NA [NA]	2.82 [1.19]	2.96 [1.12]	0.82	154
Q22: physical restraint skills	3.06 [1.12]	2.90 [0.78]	2.59 [0.69]	NA [NA]	2.82 [1.19]	2.76 [1.12]	0.71	154
Q23: self-defence	3.44 [1.15]	2.98 [0.66]	2.59 [0.69]	NA [NA]	2.88 [1.22]	2.85 [1.14]	1.96	154
Q24: knowledge of law	2.25 [0.77]	2.98 [0.66]	2.52 [0.64]	NA [NA]	2.71 [1.10]	2.85 [1.20]	2.25	154
Q25: basic security procedures	2.38 [0.89]	2.95 [0.68]	2.56 [0.58]	NA [NA]	2.18 [0.88]	2.67 [1.07]	2.95*	154
Q26: Trainees are properly assessed before certification	3.19 [1.28]	3.00 [0.79]	2.81 [1.08]	NA [NA]	2.88 [0.99]	3.35 [1.16]	1.54	154

* significant at the 0.05 level.

Background Checks

There was strong overall support for the testimonials system for applicants (Table 5a): 81% expressed support. Support for a criminal history check can be inferred from both the overall percentage of respondents supporting checks and the lack of adverse comments about the principle of a criminal history check (see Appendix 2). There was strong support (94%) for checks to be conducted prior to entry into a training course, and for frequent and regular checks on licence holders (70%). Again, as with opinions regarding training, support for criminal history checks appeared to be consistent across industry sectors (Table 5b). All seven police supported criminal checks prior to entry to training and five of the seven wanted frequent checks on licence holders.

Table 5a: Opinions on Background Checks

Check	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
Q17: Criminal history checks should occur <u>prior</u> to entry into a training course	93.6%	1.9%	4.5%	267
Q18: The requirement that licence applicants provide testimonials from three 'reputable' persons is appropriate	81.2%	4.5%	14.3%	223
Q35: Criminal history checks should be run on license holders every few months	70.3%	8.6%	21.1%	266

Table 5b. Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics. 1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.

Check	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security Hardware	In-house Security	Nightclubs	Multiple Responders	F	df
Q17: Criminal history checks should occur <u>prior</u> to entry into a training course	1.38 [0.50]	1.23 [0.43]	1.50 [0.64]	1.50 [0.89]	1.47 [0.87]	1.56 [1.15]	1.13	255
Q18: The requirement that licence applicants provide testimonials from three 'reputable' persons is appropriate	1.88 [0.72]	2.17 [1.26]	2.00 [0.78]	1.96 [1.01]	2.06 [0.83]	2.33 [1.22]	0.91	211
Q35: Criminal history checks should be run on license holders every few months	2.75 [1.06]	2.20 [1.21]	2.57 [1.00]	2.18 [1.13]	1.82 [0.73]	2.28 [1.21]	2.02	254

* significant at the 0.05 level.

Process Aspects of the Act's Development and Administration

There was a relatively high overall level of disagreement (44%) or uncertainty (41%), over the adequacy of consultation in the development of the Act (Table 6a). On the question of whether or not there was sufficient scope for continuing input from industry, 35% of the whole group agreed, 26% disagreed and 40% was unsure. There was strong support (68%) for the proposition that action should have been taken to link the development of the Queensland legislation with national standards. Only 4% disagreed. Opinions were almost equally divided between agree, disagree and unsure/don't know on the administration of the Act by the Office of Consumer Affairs. No group differences were observed across industry sectors, perhaps because of the rather high level of uncertainty expressed by many respondents (Table 6b). (While the F-statistic is significant for Q29, post-hoc analysis showed not two groups to be different at alpha=0.05).

Table 6a: Opinions on Process Aspects of the Act's Development and Administration

Issue	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
Q27: The Act was developed with sufficient consultation with the security industry	15.4%	41.0%	43.6%	266
Q28: There is sufficient scope for continuing input from the industry into the administration of the Act	34.7%	39.6%	25.7%	222
Q29: The Department of Justice should have shown more initiative in contributing towards a national licensing scheme	68.3%	27.6%	4.1%	221
Q30: The Office of Consumer Affairs is the appropriate government unit to regulate the industry	34.5%	28.1%	37.5%	267

Table 6b. Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics. 1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.

Issue	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security Hardware	In-house Security	Nightclubs	Multiple Responders	F	df
Q27: The Act was developed with sufficient consultation with the security industry	3.81 [0.91]	3.58 [1.07]	3.11 [0.90]	3.09 [1.07]	3.12 [0.93]	4.04 [1.05]	7.39	254
Q28: There is sufficient scope for continuing input from the industry into the administration of the Act	2.69 [1.01]	3.13 [1.16]	2.81 [0.83]	2.80 [1.03]	2.94 [1.09]	2.91 [1.44]	0.52	210
Q29: The Department of Justice should have shown more initiative in contributing towards a national licensing scheme	1.94 [0.68]	1.95 [1.01]	2.44 [0.80]	2.18 [0.83]	2.41 [0.80]	1.78 [0.95]	3.05*	209
Q30: The Office of Consumer Affairs is the appropriate government unit to regulate the industry	3.50 [1.10]	3.18 [1.08]	2.74 [1.05]	3.11 [1.11]	3.53 [0.94]	3.26 [1.33]	2.22	255

* significant at the 0.05 level.

A solid majority (59%) felt compliance was not effectively monitored (Table 7a), while only 11% felt it was effectively monitored. A large majority (80%) wanted security firms to carry professional indemnity insurance, and a large group (75%) also wanted auditing of employers to ensure compliance with industrial awards.

F-tests revealed several significant group differences (Table 7b). On the question of compliance monitoring the multiple responders were significantly more critical compared to those in the Security Hardware sector. On the question of compulsory professional indemnity insurance the difference appeared between Security Systems and Consultants plus Security Hardware with higher levels of disagreement (means equal 2.15 for both groups) and In-house Security with the highest level of support (mean = 1.61). Similarly, differences on auditing of compliance with industrial awards occurred between Security Systems and Consultants, Security Hardware and multiple responders on the one hand (all with higher mean levels of disagreement), and In-house Security on the other hand (mean agreement = 1.59). These group differences again may highlight differences between more inclusive groups and more narrowly focused groups (ie., In-house Security). Six of the seven police

thought the Act was not effectively monitored, and all seven thought there should be compliance checks on industrial awards.

Table 7a: Opinions on Compliance Monitoring and Insurance

Aspect	Agree	Unsure/ don't know	Disagree	Total
Q31: Compliance with the Act is effectively monitored	11.4%	29.5%	59.0%	166
Q33: 'Security firm' licence holders should carry professional indemnity insurance	80.3%	13.7%	6.0%	249
Q34: Firms employing licensees should be audited for compliance with industrial awards	75.3%	10.5%	14.2%	267

**Table 7b. Mean Agreement for each item by industry group and associated F-statistics
1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree. Standard deviations in brackets.**

Aspect	Guard & Patrol	Security Systems & Consultants	Security hardware	In- house Security	Nightclubs	Multiple Responders	F	df
Q31: Compliance with the Act is effectively monitored	4.06 [0.85]	3.55 [0.85]	3.33 [0.68]	NA [NA]	3.59 [1.12]	4.07 [1.14]	3.74*	154
Q33: 'Security firm' licence holders should carry professional indemnity insurance	1.94 [0.93]	2.15 [0.89]	2.15 [0.90]	1.61 [0.71]	NA [NA]	1.84 [1.10]	3.43*	237
Q34: Firms employing licensees should be audited for compliance with industrial awards	2.13 [1.02]	2.43 [1.13]	2.39 [1.09]	1.59 [0.78]	2.71 [1.10]	2.09 [1.21]	5.37*	255

* significant at the 0.05 level.

Written Responses

Appendix 3 shows all written comments provided in response to open ended questions. Some correspondence is also included. A minority of respondents availed themselves of the opportunity to reply to all questions in their own words. This was partly due to the contingent nature of the questions.

If you feel there are any deficiencies in training for licences, what areas need improvement?

Most of the comments on training expressed the need for a longer time period and more attention to 'people skills' of communication and negotiation, as well as self-defence, law and firearms. There were also numerous comments about the need for higher standards of instruction and assessment. Some emphasised the need for a system to facilitate advanced qualifications and accredit on-the-job training.

If you feel that different licence categories are needed for specialist training, what are these?

Areas most commonly suggested for specialist training included body guards and all electronic security system and hardware manufacturers, installers and repairers, including locksmiths.

Please describe any loopholes you are aware of in the Act?

Most respondents to the question about loopholes referred to unlicensed categories (technically not 'loopholes'). Some claimed companies were employing unlicensed guards and some supported the

claim unlicensed crowd controllers were being employed to collect glasses or as greeting staff or floor management.

If you don't think Consumer Affairs should administer the Act, which government unit should and why?

Thirty-eight respondents supported police, 18 the Department of Justice, 16 Consumer Affairs (which is within Justice), five industry self-regulation and 13 supported a separate body with representation from a variety of agencies including the industry. Some respondents emphasised the important point was commitment and zeal in enforcement.

Can you suggest any Amendments to improve the Act or its Regulations?

The majority of comments favoured comprehensive licensing and better enforcement.

Can you suggest any strategies for improving industry compliance with the spirit of the Act?

The main suggestions concerned zealous enforcement through more inspectors in the field, spot checks on licence holders, and willingness to prosecute and remove licences. There were also comments supporting better communication and co-operation between the industry and the regulators.

Fines for breaches of the Act are \$7,500 for individuals and \$37,500 for corporations. Are these appropriate? If not, what should they be and why?

There were 121 responses to this question: 96% thought the fines were appropriate. Of this group, 23 added 'if enforced'. Nine percent thought they should be higher.

Any other comments on any aspect of the Act or its administration are welcome.

Comments here were fairly disparate. There was some reiteration of the need to license more sectors, improve training and enforcement, and crackdown on under-award payments. There was a sprinkling of comments here, and in earlier sections, endorsing the WA and NSW legislation.

Discussion and Implications

The response rate of 30% was amongst the best for security surveys and the results can be taken as a good indicator of industry opinion.*

Impact of the Act

As noted in the introduction, crowd controllers were the main focus of the legislation and there is no useful official quantitative data available on assaults and other forms of violence involving crowd controllers which could be used as a test of the *Security Providers Act*. It is therefore impossible to obtain an objective measure of the impact of the Act in relation to its primary purpose. However, some support might be taken from the fact the majority of nightclub managers felt the Act had reduced assaults by crowd controllers and that crowd controllers were more effective in protecting patrons. Caution must be noted in that agreement on reductions in assaults was expressed by only 55%. A third disagreed. It should also be kept in mind that some nightclub managers may see a

* The first Australian survey of managers and operatives (Rees 1984) obtained a response rate of 17% for managers and 13% for employees. For managers, Smith (1993) obtained 21.5% and Prenzler (1995) 28%. The large *Hallcrest Report* in the United States (Cunningham and Taylor 1985) obtained 30% for security managers who were members of the American Society of Industrial Security (ASIS) and 12% from a larger survey of contract security firms. A British study comparing in-house and contract security obtained 31% (Button and George 1994). A survey on police-security relations in South Australia (Golsby and O'Brien 1996) obtained a response rate of 55% from the private sector and 57% from the public sector but this was from a combined sample of only 140 and was achieved by personal contact in a form beyond the scope of the present study.

vested interest in giving socially desirable responses. The response of the whole sample on the question of reducing assaults was equally divided between agreement, disagreement and uncertainty. There was a slightly higher level of support across all groups from improved patron protection but this was still below half (41%).

One source of support for a reduction in crowd controller violence comes from the North Queensland *Community Safety Action Projects* (Hauritz, Homel, McIlwain, Burrows and Townsley 1998). The responsible serving practices introduced in the projects reduced levels of conflict but this was below already relatively low levels. The findings were indicative of an apparent decline in violence associated with licensed premises, including violence by crowd controllers, occurring across Australia in the 1990s. Public concern and tougher licensing provisions appear to be contributing factors to this decline (Personal communication, Professor Ross Homel). Unpublished observational data from the North Queensland study showed very low levels of aggression and violence by crowd controllers and some instances of crowd controllers adopting a more positive mediating role.

The lesson from the uncertainty over the effect of the Act is that the development of legislation must have an evaluation component built in to effectively test government interventions. Evaluation must begin from the very start when legislation is developed through the collection of pre-test data and consideration of possible control groups.

Apart from the question of crowd controllers, respondents in this survey were pessimistic about the legislation removing 'shonky operators' or a 'criminal element' from the industry. Support for increased professionalism was relatively low at 41%. Of additional concern is the finding that 46% thought unlicensed persons were working in the industry. The explanation for these poor results may be found in comments below on the scope of licensing and the quality of enforcement.

Scope of Licensing

Here the survey produced clear findings, consistent across sectors, endorsing the theoretical section recommending comprehensive licensing. This should be read together with support for a national licensing system discussed below. There was also sufficient support for a revised licensing system to be given consideration. Replacing separate licences with a single licence with specialist endorsements should make it cheaper for licensees to add endorsements. It could also allow for efficiencies in training with a core curriculum taught to most trainees before separating into specialist classes. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask for opinions on the licence fee. The cost of a licence has generated some controversy. A recent *Security Australia* report (Dolahenty 1998) identified inconsistencies between jurisdictions and questioned the rationale for fees that bring in over \$9 million annually to government. (In Queensland a security firm licence costs \$423 per annum and other licences cost \$84 with a \$106 fee for a dual licence.)

Licensing of locksmiths has been a contentious issue (see CLRC 1995:73-74). By virtue of their technical knowledge locksmiths have a high potential for crime. However, there is little evidence of any realisation of this potential and locksmiths generally have a good reputation. The trend, nonetheless, appears to be towards licensing because of the criminal potential. The Queensland Director of the Master Locksmiths Association of Australasia (MLAA) stated to the researchers his organisation was 'in favour of licensing for locksmiths, but it must be structured to benefit the community'. A letter was also received from the Chief Executive of the MLAA supporting a national licensing system that would include locksmiths. In this survey Locksmiths were included with Security Systems and Consultants. On the question 'should security system installers and repairers be licensed', of the 35 respondents who self-identified exclusively as locksmiths, 32 agreed, two were uncertain and one disagreed.

Training

A questionable finding was the support shown for specific elements of the training program. It should be noted that while the Act stipulates 24 hours (three days), most programs run for five days. This may help explain the possible disjunction between support for the achievement of specific competencies and apparent opposition to the minimum hours. It should also be noted that the adequacy of training received majority support (51%) for only one area - basic security procedures. Additionally, it appears improvements have resulted from the delegation of training standards to

Training Queensland with improvements in qualifications of trainers and scrutiny of courses. Almost half of the respondents agreed improvements had occurred and 42% was unsure; presumably because they did not have experience with the new system or new graduates. Despite these qualifications, the current system still appears to make for an impossibly crowded curriculum. A limited number of interviews with licence holders (Prenzler et al. 1998) showed they were sceptical about the adequacy of what they were taught. Issue must be taken with the view that five days of training can teach sufficient skills in the vital areas of communication, conflict resolution, physical restraint, and law; and possibly also in basic security procedures. Comments made in the open-ended section of the questionnaire were particularly favourable toward longer training periods, and greater attention to communication and conflict resolution skills. There is a Security Industry Training Advisory Committee (SITAC) associated with the *Security Providers Act* which needs to give greater attention to this question.

The view that more extensive training is required for entry-level competency in security receives support from a number of research projects and inquiries. Following violent incidents related to licensed premises in the Brisbane central business district in 1997 a taskforce of police, security managers, public servants and licensees recommended a range of initiatives including that 'the standard of current training [for crowd controllers] be made more relevant', the minimum age be raised from 18 to 21 and the disqualifying offences be expanded (CCLMC 1997:10). In one case involving manslaughter of a crowd controller there was some evidence of provocative behaviour by crowd controllers and no evidence of any informed or systematic conflict resolution strategies. The judge recommended better training of crowd controllers in people management and diffusing conflict (Bradford 1998; Turner 1998; *R v. Phu Thanh Truong* (Supreme Court of Queensland Criminal Jurisdiction; Dowsett J., 2 March 1998, unreported).

The discussion paper produced by the Department of Justice in initiating development of the *Security Providers Act* suggested that hotel management needed training in proper management of crowd controllers. This was in response to background research for the Victorian legislation which identified poor management practices as a major contributing factor to crowd controller violence. Management was found to be either neglectful of staff or actively encouraged aggressive behaviour (VCCAV 1990). Crowd controllers were also frequently victims of violence. The Queensland discussion paper proposed consideration of a requirement that liquor licence applicants complete a course on management of crowd controllers. Unfortunately, this option was ignored. Conducted properly, a short course might be beneficial in communicating current knowledge about the size, nature and causes of violence associated with licensed premises and of the importance of responsible management practices (see Homel et al. 1997).

More generally, there is a growing body of research supporting extending training periods for security licence applicants. Prenzler's (1995) Australia-wide survey of security managers found the large majority of respondents (93%) supported a minimum training period of one year for operatives (not necessarily all pre-service). There was also a very high level of support (86%) for the more radical measure of compulsory minimum training for managers. Considerations of competency and ethics have led numerous inquiries to criticise current pre-service training and recommend extensions beyond the usual mandated minimum of three to five days (e.g., DCA 1993; CLRC 1995; Mountney 1995; NSWPS 1995; IRCNSW 1996; CCLMC 1997; Tate 1997).

A 1997 review of communication skills for guards in NSW, prior to the new Act, found the two day mandated course 'too short' to cover the complex range of communication tasks required. Assessment standards were also criticised as being essentially 'no-fail' and there was a major concern with the lack of qualified trainers. The report concluded:

The perception that security guard work is a low skilled job is incorrect, as the job demands a comprehensive range of communication skills. In examining the literacy, language and numeracy tasks involved in guard work it is clear that these tasks are an integral and crucial part of the daily work... The growing demand for effective security services in a wide range of situations, the increasing importance of customer service and the need to be familiar with a range of technology all impact on communication skills. To meet these challenges it is important to reform the current training both on and off the job and enable guards to upgrade their LL&N skills in order to provide a more effective service to the community and assist in the prevention of crime (NSWPSITAB 1997:20).

The report endorsed the new *National Security Industry Competency Standards for Security Officers* released by Property Services Training Australia (PSTA 1996).

There were two other issues relating to training covered in the survey. On the question of the adequacy of firearms training under the *Weapons Act*, respondents were equally divided between agreement, disagreement and uncertainty. The current system certainly cannot claim it has the support of the industry and evidence from a variety of sources suggests that the threat to the public and to guards from guns is sufficient to justify an expanded training program (NSWPS 1995; QIRC 1996; IRCNSW 1997; Prenzler 1998).

In Prenzler et al's (1998) exploratory evaluation of the *Security Providers Act*, interviewees were extremely sceptical about the quality of assessment in training. *Training Queensland* probably needs to look more closely at this issue given that opinions were almost equally divided in the survey (29% agreed trainees were properly assessed, 34% disagreed and 26% was unsure).

Background Checks

Respondents supported criminal history checks prior to entry to a training course where skills are learnt which can be used for the wrong purposes. This received the highest level of overall support (94%). Recognition of the problem of identifying licence holders who commit disqualifying offences was also evident in very strong support for regular and frequent checks. The researchers had argued the testimonial system was 'subjective and unreliable'. However, respondents supported its retention and clearly considered it can be beneficial in reducing access to the industry by undesirables.

Process Aspects of the Act's Development and Administration

In keeping with the researchers' initial criticism of consultation during the Act's development, very few respondents thought the level of consultation was sufficient. A large proportion (44%) disagreed and a large proportion (41%) was unsure or didn't know. It should be noted the process of consultation began well when the Department of Justice released its discussion paper and the Security Industry Representative Committee (SIRC) was formed with representation from the Queensland Security Association (QSA), Australian Security Industry Association (ASIAL) and trade organisations. However, relations broke down and it is extremely unfortunate that more could not have been done to repair the lines of communication and to include more of the industry's recommendations which have been largely supported by this survey. This would have produced a form of 'responsive regulation' more likely to succeed through acceptance of the rules the industry helped develop (Ayers and Braithwaite 1995).

Opinions were once again fairly evenly divided over scope for continuing input into the administration of the Act. At present there is no consultative committee concerned with the administration of the whole Act. There is a Security Industry Training Advisory Committee (SITAC) of the Business Services Industry Training Council (Qld) with representation from Consumer Affairs; and a Police/Security Industry Liaison Board (PSILB) formed in 1996. The latter is part of a nation-wide development following a decision at the South Pacific Police Commissioners' Conference in 1995. In Queensland, the establishment of the police liaison group stimulated the formation of a Security Industry Regulatory Council (SIRC2) from ASIAL, ASIS, QSA, SITC and the MLAA. This more representative group has managed to maintain cohesion and recently published a discussion paper advocating most of the recommendations supported in this study: comprehensive, nationally-based, regulation; improved training; a code of ethics; compulsory insurance (SIRC 1997, Ballinger 1997). The QSA also made separate recommendations for a similar model with a focus on establishment of a Control Board which, amongst other things, would adjudicate a code of conduct (QSA 1997). An enforceable code of conduct should be part of the training curriculum and cover issues such as confidentiality, privacy, honesty, impartiality, discrimination and gratuities (see also CLRC 1995:105ff).

There was no agreement about the suitability of the Office of Consumer Affairs (part of the Department of Justice) to administer the Act, but there was no agreed upon alternatives in the written comments. Police were proposed by many respondents, but this exacerbates the potential for collusion between the two groups (see ICAC 1992; CLRC 1995; Ombudsman 1997) and, arguably,

police should be left alone to 'fight crime' rather than regulate industry. The location is perhaps not so important. What is essential is that the regulatory agency take an approach to compliance and industry professionalisation which is independent, proactive, consultative and research-based.

A majority of survey respondents (59%) expressed concern about monitoring of compliance with the Act (only 11% thought monitoring was adequate). Suggestions for improvements included expanded criminal history checks and more field checks on licence holders. The results might be read as at least partial support for the suggestion that greater use be made of covert observations of operatives - crowd controllers in particular - as part of an enhanced compliance audit program. Observational studies and venue risk assessments were also recommended in the Brisbane Central City review mentioned above (CCLMC 1997).

Surprisingly perhaps, there was strong support (75%) for checks on compliance with industrial awards. It had been thought that, as employers, respondents might be supportive of tolerance towards under-award payments of licensees; but this was not the case. The result might best be read as support for a level playing field and opposition to those who would undercut competition with under-award wages. There was also a very high level of support (80%) for security firms carrying professional indemnity insurance. Only 6% disagreed. Extension of this to other insurances (product liability, public liability, work cover) seems reasonable in terms of the threat posed to property and safety by failures to provide the quality of security promised and the potential loss of compensation to victims through civil action when firms go bankrupt.

Developments in Other States

The results of this survey provide industry endorsement from Queensland for key elements of the new legislation in other states, especially NSW, WA and SA. In particular, there is support for comprehensive licensing. In WA this extends to locksmiths and in NSW it includes key cutters. Compulsory public liability cover for security firms is also a feature of the proposed NSW Regulations, and the NSW Act requires review after five years.

The survey also endorses plans attached to the proposed Regulations to initiate national licensing beginning with endorsement of the *National Security Industry Competency Standards for Security Officers*. WA has already linked course approval to the *Competency Standards*. This is a positive move, although the *Competency Standards* are less a proper curriculum than a list of competencies with no recommended minimum time periods, and they appear to be particularly weak on legal issues and ethics. In WA, training periods remain short at 4-5 days. In NSW the details of training requirements are being developed by the Vocational Training Accreditation Board with scope for accreditation of courses operating prior to the Act and an assessment process for current workers not covered by these. The proposed Regulations refer to entry-level competencies with 12 months to complete further competencies. NSW, however, seems to have suffered from some of the developmental ambiguities experienced in Queensland. Training standards were not determined before the Act was passed and the proposed Regulations still do not state notional minimum training periods for licence applicants with no prior learning. VETAB has determined that applicants for licences such as security officers and crowd controllers must have completed an average of seven units from the national *Competency Standards*. There are some indications that an approved course might average about seven hours per unit, making for an average of 50 hours. (NSWVETAB 1998; DKTD 1997). This is an improvement on Queensland but still questionable. Courses for applicants in SA now average 100 hours (Personal Communication, Project Officer, Business and Occupation Services) and three to four weeks appears as a better starting point subject to confirmation from the evaluation studies that should be conducted.

The NSW, WA and SA licensing systems contain some other questionable elements which might need amendment before serving as national models. The SA Act excludes locksmiths, although there are some moves at present to include this area. Exclusion of offenders for life is also questionable from a rehabilitation perspective. The more common period of ten years appears more reasonable. In WA, criminal histories are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Exclusion is not automatic. In WA and NSW the legislation is administered by police. In NSW, employers of security staff must hold a 'Master Licence' and this may be a disincentive for in-house security. There is some evidence that in-house security can provide more effective site-specific security with greater staff commitment than contract security. Employment conditions are also likely to be better in the in-house sector. (See

Clarke 1992; Button and George 1994; VCCAV 1990.) Increased licence fees for greater numbers of employees, as proposed for the NSW Regulations, provides an employment disincentive (up to \$2,000 for more than 50 employees). The NSW Act also employs awkward language with a 'Master Licence' for employers and coded employee classifications (Classes 1A-C and 2A-D). The latter do not evoke a professional image; nor does the requirement that only individuals employed by the holder of a master licence are eligible to hold an operatives licence. This ties licensees to employers and would appear to create practical difficulties for operatives who lose their job or must obtain a licence before obtaining employment. Unlike NSW, WA has provision for an enforceable code of conduct but this has not been finalised.

Lessons for Research

Some problems were experienced with the research method employed in this study. The response rate was uneven and poor for some industry sectors. More in-depth studies might make better use of personal contact in delivery or receipt of questionnaires (see Golsby and O'Brien 1996) or use interviews. This would be expensive, although some interviews could be done over the phone as was done in this project with some police. Research focused on one sector of the industry could attempt to interview all members of the sample group in a given jurisdiction given that numbers may be more manageable. For example, the sample of nightclub managers in this study was 56. However, to properly probe issues, a sample of crowd controllers should be interviewed for comparative purposes. Surveys or interviews with nightclub patrons would also be a source of valuable information. Interviews would have the usual advantages of allowing for clarification of ambiguous responses and correction of ambiguous questions.

Summary of Recommendations

1. There should be comprehensive licensing across all security fields (other than those with their own forms of specialisation and control such as police and military). Questions remain about how many related occupations need coverage, such as administrative staff in a security firm, but all the main players should be covered. Licensing should therefore be extended beyond crowd controllers, guards, private investigators and firms to include security system installers and repairers, public and private in-house security, security consultants, control room operators and security firm representatives.
2. Licensing should be national to allow for consistency, interstate portability of licences, removal of 'havens' for licence applicants rejected in other jurisdictions, and nation-wide criminal history and other checks.
3. Criminal history checks should be conducted prior to entry to a training course.
4. Criminal history checks should be conducted at frequent intervals on current licence holders.
5. The requirement that licence applicants supply testimonials from 'reputable' persons has industry support and should be retained, at least for the time being. Research should be undertaken into ways of establishing more objective tests to determine who is a 'fit and proper person' (See CLRC 1995:117-20).
6. Monitoring should include compliance with industrial awards.
7. Consideration should be given to compulsory insurance for security firm licence holders including professional indemnity, product liability, public liability and work cover for employees. Broader insurance cover would help ensure re-dress of wrongs against customers, employees and the public.
8. The currently mandated minimum training standards in Queensland (between 24 and 38 hours) are inadequate to develop pre-employment competency or to ensure in-service operatives and managers have sufficient knowledge of legal and technical aspects of their work. While there appeared to be support in the survey for the content of current courses, about half of all respondents indicated the time periods were insufficient. Three-four weeks seems more reasonable to provide the most basic coverage, especially in the vital areas of legal rights and responsibilities, ethics, communication and conflict resolution, and physical restraint and self defence skills. But the adequacy of the content, duration and learning modes of entry-level training courses must be tested.
9. Flexibility in training requirements is necessary for recognition of prior learning and in-house training.
10. Firearms training needs to be extended with more attention to safety (under the *Weapons Act*).
11. Assessment and certification standards need to be more stringent. It is appropriate this is controlled by vocational training departments with security industry and regulatory agency representation.
12. Managers of licensed premises should be required to take a short course on the management of crowd controllers. The course would include current knowledge about the size, nature and causes of violence associated with licensed premises; and of the importance of responsible management practices (see Homel et al. 1997). This requirement would belong to liquor licensing legislation.

13. The survey revealed sufficient support for consideration of a revised licensing system. Replacing separate licenses with a single licence with specialist endorsements should make it cheaper for licensees to add specialist endorsements. It could also allow for efficiencies in training with a core curriculum which could be taught to most trainees before separating into specialist classes.
14. Despite industry dissatisfaction with the Office of Consumer Affairs as the regulating body, there appears little basis for transfer of responsibilities. The Police Service should not act as an industry regulator, although it should retain control of firearms licensing and registration.
15. It does appear Consumer Affairs needs to take a more dedicated and proactive approach to regulation both in terms of enforcement and in leadership in industry professionalisation. This would include a mission for research and the development of opportunities for higher qualifications.
16. The regulatory agency needs to give more attention to finding effective compliance monitoring strategies.
17. A code of conduct should be developed to cover ethical issues in security and set standards of conduct which can be enforced through an inquisitorial tribunal and complaints investigations by the regulatory agency.
18. Provision needs to be made for an impact study of the amended Act and for regular appraisal of the performance of the legislation and its enforcement.
19. Consultation with the industry needs to be expanded, with a standing industry and stakeholder committee advising the regulatory agency.
20. To aid in the adoption of these recommendations the security industry needs to establish a single national body representing all the separate trade, industrial and state bodies. This is essential to effectively lobby the Commonwealth Government to co-ordinate development of a model Act and regulations, to give the model legislation legitimacy, and to achieve endorsement by the states and territories. (There is at present an Australian Security Industry Forum which needs better funding and more consistent representation from across the industry and the country (Ballinger 1997)).
21. The main initiative, however, should come from the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department to set up a national security regulation development committee which would co-ordinate the states and territories and the industry. If the industry is unable to create a representative liaison body, then this should be facilitated by the federal government body.

References

- Adams, J (1997) NSW Manpower Legislation: Get Ready for Change. *Security Australia*. November:20-21, 26.
- Ayers, I and Braithwaite, J (1995) *Responsive Regulation: Transcending the Deregulation Debate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ballinger, I (1997) Security Industry Organisations in Australia - Another Perspective. *ASISistance*. October-December:7-8.
- Bradford, S (1998) Judge Urges Action After Nightclub Killings. *Courier Mail*, 5 March:5.
- Button, M and George, B (1994) Why Some Organisations Prefer In-house to Contract Security Staff. In M Gill, ed., *Crime at Work*. Leicester: Perpetuity.
- CCLMC (1997) *Report*. Brisbane: Central City Licensing Management Committee.
- Clarke, R (1992) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. New York, Harrow and Heston.
- CLRC (1995) *Security Protection and Investigation Industries in the ACT*. Canberra: Community Law Reform Committee of the Australian Capital Territory.
- Cunningham, W, and Taylor, T (1985) *Private Security and Police in America: The Hallcrest Report I*. Boston: Butterworths-Heinemann.
- Cunningham, W, Strauchs, J and van Meter, C (1990) *Private Security Trends, 1970 to 2000, The Hallcrest Report II*. Stoneham, MA: Butterworths-Heinemann.
- DCA (1993) *Review of Private Investigation Industry: Discussion Paper*. Sydney: NSW Department of Consumer Affairs.
- DKTDS (1997) *National Security Industry Training Project: Draft Curriculum*. Canberra: David Kay Training and Development Services.
- Dolahenty, A (1998) Licensed to Bill: The \$9m Question. *Security Australia*. March:13.
- Golsby, M and O'Brien, R (1996). *A Co-operative Approach to Crime Prevention: Police and Security Sectors Working Together*. Perth: Australian Institute of Security and Applied Technology, Edith Cowan University.
- Hauritz, M, Homel, R., McIlwain, G, Burrows, T and Townsley, M (1998) Reducing Violence in Licenses Premises Through Community Action Projects: The Queensland Experience. *Contemporary Drug Problems*. In press.
- Homel, R., Hauritz, M, Wortley, R, McIlwain, G and Carvolth, R (1997) Preventing Alcohol-Related Crime Through Community Action: the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project. *Crime Prevention Studies*. 7, 35-90.
- Hume, J (1996) National Standards Raise Hopes for Licensing Overhaul. *Security Australia*. June 14:16.
- ICAC (1992) *Report on the Unauthorised Release of Information*, Vol. 1. Sydney: Independent Commission Against Corruption.
- IRCNSW (1996) *Matter No. IRC1880 of 1995, Reference by the Minister for Industrial Relations Pursuant to S.345(4) of the Industrial Relations Act 1991 Regarding the Transport and Delivery of Cash and Other Valuables Industry*. Sydney: Industrial Relations Commission of NSW.
- Mountney, P (1995) *Report on a Dacum Study for Queensland Security Industry Trainers*. Brisbane: Centre for Skill Formation Research and Development, Griffith University.
- NSWPS (1995) *Security Industry Review*. Sydney: NSW Police Service.
- NSWPSITAB (1997) *Communication Skills and Training in the Security Industry - Manpower*. Sydney: NSW Property Services Industry Training Advisory Body.
- NSWVETAB (1998) *Transitional Arrangements: Security Industry*. Sydney: NSW Vocational Education and Training Accreditation Board.
- Ombudsman (1997) *Operation Bart: Investigation of Allegations Against Police in Relation to the Shutter Allocation System*. Melbourne: The Ombudsman Victoria.
- Prenzler, T (1995) Security Managers' Perceptions of Industry Regulation: An Australian Study. *Security Journal*. 6/2:227-34.
- Prenzler, T, Baxter, T and Draper, R (1998) Special Legislation for the Security Industry: A Case Study. *International Journal of Risk, Security and Crime Prevention*. 3/1:21-33.
- Prenzler, T. (1998) Contract Security and the Problem of Trust: The Australian Experience. *Revue Criminologie*. In press. A copy in English is available from the author.
- PSTA (1996) *National Security Industry Competency Standards for Security Officers*. Canberra: Property Services Training Australia.

- QIRC (1996) *Report of the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission: Industrial Matters Relating to the Cash-In-Transit Industry in Queensland*. Brisbane: Division of Workplace Health and Safety, QIRC.
- QSA (1997) *Submission to the Minister for Justice for Review of the Security Providers Act*. Brisbane: Queensland Security Association.
- Rees, A. (1984) *Private Security in Australia*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Sarre, R (1998) Accountability and the Private Sector: Putting Accountability of Private Security Under the Spotlight. *Security Journal*. 9/1. In press.
- SIRC (1997) *Queensland Security Industry Regulation: The 20 Basic Requirements*. Brisbane: Security Industry Regulatory Council.
- Smith, C (1993) The Potential for Research in the Security Industry. Paper presented to the *Fourth Annual Australian Security Hardware and Access Control Conference*. Adelaide. 6-7 April.
- Tate, P. (1997) *Report on Security Industry Training: Case Study of an Emerging Industry*. Perth: Western Australian Department of Training and Australian National Training Authority.
- Turner, M (1998) Heavy Duty. *Courier Mail*, 6 March:13.
- VCCAV (1990) *Inquiry into Violence In and Around Licensed Premises*. Melbourne: Victorian Community Council Against Violence.

Legislation

- Security Industry Act 1997* (New South Wales)
- Security Industry Regulation 1998* (New South Wales) (proposed)
- Security Providers Act 1993* (Queensland)
- Security Providers Regulation 1995* (Queensland)
- Security and Investigation Agents Act 1995* (South Australia)

Cases

- R v. Phu Thanh Truong* (Supreme Court of Queensland Criminal Jurisdiction; Dowsett J., 2 March 1998, unreported).

Appendices

Appendix 1: Generic Questionnaire

Please circle your answer

SA = STRONGLY AGREE A = AGREE D = DISAGREE SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

U = UNSURE/DON'T KNOW

1. The Act has reduced assaults by crowd controllers in licensed venues	SA A D SD U
2. The Act has removed shonky operators from the industry	SA A D SD U
3. The Act has removed a criminal element from the industry	SA A D SD U
4. The security industry is more professional as a result of the Act	SA A D SD U
5. The Act has made crowd controllers more effective in protecting patrons	SA A D SD U
6. Four licence categories are appropriate (These are 'crowd controller', 'private investigator', 'security officer' and 'security firm')	SA A D SD U
7. The following exempt categories of security functions should be licensed: Security system installers and repairers	SA A D SD U
8. In-house security officers	SA A D SD U
9. Security consultants	SA A D SD U
10. Control room operators	SA A D SD U
11. Security firm representatives	SA A D SD U
12. A single licence (based on core skills) with specialist endorsements would be a better system	SA A D SD U
13. Training periods under the Act are appropriate to the job: crowd controllers 24hrs	SA A D SD U
14. private investigators 35hrs	SA A D SD U
15. security officers 38hrs	SA A D SD U
16. Firearms training for security officers under the <i>Weapons Act</i> is adequate	SA A D SD U
17. Criminal history checks should occur prior to entry into a training course	SA A D SD U
18. The requirement that licence applicants provide testimonials from three 'reputable' persons is appropriate	SA A D SD U
19. Recently <i>Training Queensland</i> set clearer standards for trainers' qualifications and course content. This has improved training standards.	SA A D SD U
20. Training courses teach adequate: communication skills	SA A D SD U
21. conflict resolution skills	SA A D SD U
22. physical restraint skills	SA A D SD U
23. self-defence	SA A D SD U
24. knowledge of law	SA A D SD U
25. basic security procedures	SA A D SD U
26. Trainees are properly assessed before certification	SA A D SD U
27. The Act was developed with sufficient consultation with the security industry	SA A D SD U
28. There is sufficient scope for continuing input from the industry into the administration of the Act	SA A D SD U
29. The Department of Justice should have shown more initiative in contributing towards a national licensing scheme	SA A D SD U
30. The Office of Consumer Affairs is the appropriate government unit to regulate the industry	SA A D SD U
31. Compliance with the Act is effectively monitored	SA A D SD U
32. Very few unlicensed persons are working in areas where licences are required	SA A D SD U
33. 'Security firm' licence holders should carry professional indemnity insurance	SA A D SD U
34. Security firms should be audited for compliance with industrial awards	SA A D SD U
35. Criminal history checks should be run on licence holders every few months	SA A D SD U

Please provide written responses about the following

36. If you feel there are deficiencies in training for licences, what areas need improvement?

37. If you feel that different licence categories are needed for specialist training, what are these?

38. Please describe any loopholes that you are aware of in the Act

39. If you don't think that Consumer Affairs should administer the Act, which government unit should and why?

40. Can you suggest any amendments to improve the Act or the regulations?

41. Can you suggest any strategies for improving industry compliance with the spirit of the Act?

42. Fines for breaches of the Act are \$7,500 for individuals and \$37,500 for corporations. Are these appropriate? If not, what should they be and why?

43. Any other comments on any aspects of the Act or its administration are welcome

Some quick questions about you and your company (please circle)

44. Do you own your own firm? Yes No

45. Are you a chief executive? Yes No

46. Are you a middle manager? Yes No

47. Are you in a different category to the above? Please describe _____

Which of the following best describes your company's security work? (please tick all that apply)

48. ___ Guard and Patrol Services (includes crowd controller providers & cash in-transit)

49. ___ Security Systems and Consultants (includes representatives, investigators & trainers)

50. ___ Security Doors, Windows and Equipment Services

51. ___ In-house Security Management (government departments and major retail firms)

52. ___ Locksmiths

53. ___ Night Club Management

54. Approximately how many staff are employed in your organisation in Queensland (e.g., all employees, not just security operatives, in Retail Company X or Contract Security Company Y)?

Appendix 2: Written Responses

*Italicised comments are the transcriber's

*Numbers following comments correspond with numbers in on questionnaires

36. If you feel there are any deficiencies in training for licenses, what areas need improvement?

- ⇒ The whole course is too short (1)
- ⇒ Training far too short - too readily available (2)
- ⇒ More training on practical side (3)
- ⇒ The regulations for security system installers are too loose (5)
- ⇒ Training should reflect the type of security work being performed & should be more constant at less cost (7)
- ⇒ Include electronic security (8)
- ⇒ CCTV industry is not covered (9)
- ⇒ Need on the job training (12)
- ⇒ Training for security installers (14)
- ⇒ More education required in all areas (16)
- ⇒ More pre-requisites, i.e. OP score (school leaving), completion year 12, literacy levels A method to improve training levels beyond the basics w/o just creating another bureaucracy National licenses as a level above state licenses (17)
- ⇒ Specialist areas e.g. health care, high risk areas e.g. defense (18)
- ⇒ Customer skills, technical competence (21)
- ⇒ Hands on experience (22)
- ⇒ No comment Not aware of specific training requirements (23)
- ⇒ I do not believe there is sufficient time (24)
- ⇒ More training, extensive supervision professional qualifications (25)
- ⇒ Should be industry controlled through ITAB (27)
- ⇒ unsure (28)
- ⇒ all areas (31)
- ⇒ Uniformity, and solution resolving disputes communication (33)
- ⇒ Some too young + are unable to gain respect (34)
- ⇒ Communication skills & conflict resolution skills without resorting to physical encounters in relation to crowd controllers Basic security procedures with emphasis placed on actual requirements rather than theoretical conditions (35)
- ⇒ Are being addressed by ITAS (36)
- ⇒ More verbal skills required and self defense skills (37)
- ⇒ Companies that give 'trainees' answers? Illiterate students passing? (39)
- ⇒ Not enough screening process for experience of applicants (41)
- ⇒ Communication skills - conflict resolution - physical restraint - self defense (43)
- ⇒ Sec/off - crowd controllers need ongoing training (44)
- ⇒ Alarm + access control system installer to be licensed (45)
- ⇒ Better control/ auditing of instructors, venues and course content (46)
- ⇒ Should have course of 6-8 weeks duration similar to police & carried out by a govt body (48)
- ⇒ The trainers should be first trained and have up to date field knowledge (50)
- ⇒ More thorough training (51)
- ⇒ Requirements of Act should be aligned to national competencies (53)
- ⇒ In our industry (security screens) it is too easy to obtain QBSA licenses (55)
- ⇒ Suitability, adherence to regulations, monitoring (56)
- ⇒ Potential guards should be informed more of what security is about - the laws governing guards should be put in a handbook which pertains to the industry (57)
- ⇒ More on the job training + incentives for employers to train staff (59)
- ⇒ Standards books should be provided with licenses (60)
- ⇒ 20 years ago it took time to check us out - From the day we're born (not now) (65)
- ⇒ Training emphasis alters from school to school despite the training's standards (66)
- ⇒ Basic procedures - conflict resolution (68)
- ⇒ Communication skills, what an employer expects from a qualified person (69)
- ⇒ There should be a probationary period with on the job training (70)
- ⇒ A level 1 (one competency) should be reached for license (72)
- ⇒ Law, communications (74)
- ⇒ Sec Guards and other officers need more training in all facets off this industry [sic] (75)
- ⇒ Have not heard of the Act so can't respond (79)
- ⇒ none (80)

- ⇒ Ability assessments (81)
- ⇒ People skills (84)
- ⇒ All courses should be "certificates" level (85)
- ⇒ Conflict resolution skills (86)
- ⇒ Nearly all (87)
- ⇒ No knowledge (90)
- ⇒ Learn more about people, the general public (92)
- ⇒ Theory may be learned 100%, but practical & ongoing job trg is severely lacking (93)
- ⇒ The current courses do not teach "coal face" issues (94)
- ⇒ Law subjects need improvement (97)
- ⇒ Private industry should do it not government screw ups (98)
- ⇒ Especially in fire arm situations - training should be more exacting & constant (99)
- ⇒ Attitudes (100)
- ⇒ Don't know (101)
- ⇒ Self defence, physical restraint, weapons (102)
- ⇒ Adequate but should have "X" hours public pistol range prior to course (103)
- ⇒ Communications, self defense (105)
- ⇒ General behaviour + communication skills need more work (106)
- ⇒ Training requires 6 monthly audits (107)
- ⇒ Some personnel are not suited (108)
- ⇒ Crowd control / alarm installers / control room operators (109)
- ⇒ Firearms training (110)
- ⇒ Security as a service, overall improvement on subject matter (111)
- ⇒ Crowd control is inadequate Increased hours needed Competency can't be judged on attitude unfortunately (112)
- ⇒ On hands experience - trainee's go on the street with a security co first (113)
- ⇒ More range practice (114)
- ⇒ Percentage of passes should be greater (117)
- ⇒ Unsure (118)
- ⇒ Personal contact with patrons - use of common sense (119)
- ⇒ Communication skills, conflict resolution skills (120)
- ⇒ 3 years min training in all aspects of the industry (122)
- ⇒ Speak to Tony Zalewski (Advanced Training Techniques) in Melbourne - his course is what is recommended His phone no is (03) 9654 7955 (124)
- ⇒ There is not enough time spent You can't teach people about people in 24 hrs (125)
- ⇒ Should be more ongoing (ie law amendment) maintaining skills (126)
- ⇒ Knowledge of the law (128)
- ⇒ Training in conflict resolution (129)
- ⇒ Public relations skills - interpersonal skills training (130)
- ⇒ Course structure & reference materials non-specific training - too general auditing of assessment performed by trainers (131)
- ⇒ All areas in QLD are deficient (132)
- ⇒ 'Crowd controllers' should be police function (135)
- ⇒ Unsure of all (?)of security (140)
- ⇒ Apprenticeship scheme totally inadequate (142)
- ⇒ Do not know the training involved (146)
- ⇒ Spot checks for new security companies that appear overnight (152)
- ⇒ Unfamiliar Most personnel converted from sub agent - no training!! (154)
- ⇒ SG3 is too expensive (155)
- ⇒ Accountability, professionalism, privacy, lack of specific "powers" (legislative) of security providers (158)
- ⇒ Personal management / people skills (160)
- ⇒ That there is not enough concentration on legislation (161)
- ⇒ Who checks the workplace trainer? Licenses can be bought for the right amount (162)
- ⇒ Criminal checks stepped up Screen checks (163)
- ⇒ Weapons training needs to be more psychologically based Too many wierdos with gun licenses Independent examiners need to be brought in Uniform questions need to be asked (165)
- ⇒ Pass is too easy - training organisations reluctant to fail paying customers (166)
- ⇒ Self defence (167)
- ⇒ I do not believe that time allowed is adequate (168)
- ⇒ I do not believe that time allowed is adequate (169)
- ⇒ All areas (173)

- ⇒ How to handle different situations (using the brain) (174)
- ⇒ None (176)
- ⇒ More emphasis on public relations (177)
- ⇒ More on the job training (178)
- ⇒ (1) Responsible serving of alcohol (Programme) (179)
- ⇒ Security history checks (180)
- ⇒ Everyone trained at same competency level Push to national level Need regulatory body to enforce (183)
- ⇒ As all security officers may possess batons and handcuffs under the Weapons Act 1990, then all should receive initial training (184)
- ⇒ Crowd controllers - conflict resolution (185)
- ⇒ Unable to comment (186)
- ⇒ More training - Criminal code in particular (187)
- ⇒ Firearms training (some guards couldn't shoot to save their & other lives) *It is well & good to know the legislation & safety aspects but more emphasis needed on practical shooting (188)
- ⇒ Core skills appropriate to job description (189)
- ⇒ Training for crowd controllers as inadequate They are not prepared [prepared] for what can ultimately happen to them (190)
- ⇒ Not enough time spent on "coal face" issues (192)
- ⇒ Conflict resolution, communication, need to learn to resolve conflict without force (193)
- ⇒ Communication skills etc mentioned above (194)
- ⇒ Improved standards More emphasis on resolving conflict without confrontation (195)

37. If you feel that different licence categories are needed for specialist training, what are these?

- ⇒ Controllers/personal escort work (2)
- ⇒ unsure (3)
- ⇒ Personal body guard (5)
- ⇒ Inclusion of the locksmithing industry (6)
- ⇒ Separate licenses for the broader categories of security work e.g State (?) security, armed duties, crowd controllers, tertiary private & government sectors (7)
- ⇒ Yes - electronic security (8)
- ⇒ CCTV installers (9)
- ⇒ No self employment until 2 years as guards (12)
- ⇒ Monitoring, control room operator Monitoring control room managers (13)
- ⇒ Security installers (14)
- ⇒ Portability & compatibility between licenses & States needs to be addressed we need a national license in addition to rather than just a State based licenses (17)
- ⇒ Health care, government departments/authorities/schools (18)
- ⇒ no comment (19)
- ⇒ 1 installer, 2 security offs, 3 consultant, 4 P I , 5 surveil op (21)
- ⇒ I agree with endorsements fro different categories (23)
- ⇒ Close personal protection, body guard, sales consultants, operations/control room (25)
- ⇒ See QSA submission (27)
- ⇒ Every different area/categories deserve expert training (28)
- ⇒ alarm installers, suppliers, locksmiths (29)
- ⇒ Locksmiths & electronics (31)
- ⇒ Diplomatic protection in extreme risk areas (33)
- ⇒ Security system installation (our field of operation) (42)
- ⇒ One license Body guard category - crowd controller category - officer category - private invest cat (43)
- ⇒ Depends on areas sec/officers want to specialise in (44)
- ⇒ Access control (45)
- ⇒ License categories should include all technical aspects (47)
- ⇒ Security installer specialist license for each separately 1 alarms, 2 locks, 3 security doors & grilles (49)
- ⇒ First the industry should be dissected to identify "specialist areas" then train (50)
- ⇒ Something to cover manufacturer/installation of household security (52)
- ⇒ I think locksmiths should be included into this (54)
- ⇒ You should have at least 5 years of prior training in the field you are dealing in (55)
- ⇒ Q 7,8,9,10,11 appears adequate (*strongly agreed or agreed that these categories should be licensed*) (56)

- ⇒ Alarm installers license which should include most security devices (57)
- ⇒ Security manufacturers & installers (window & door) should be licensed (58)
- ⇒ Alarm installation, control room operators (59)
- ⇒ My son did the course & his license nearly boat him home (?) (65)
- ⇒ Dog handlers and as per Q 7-11 (*strongly agreed that all should be licensed*) (68)
- ⇒ As per WA/NSW (70)
- ⇒ Yes, security equipment alarm installers, consultants (71)
- ⇒ Security alarms - locksmiths - security guards - plus weapons (72)
- ⇒ In most States locksmiths are licensed. Why not QLD? Too many shonky ones (75)
- ⇒ Different jobs need different training therefore different licenses (78)
- ⇒ Security system installers & repairers should be included (79)
- ⇒ None (80)
- ⇒ Each category - single license (81)
- ⇒ 1. Instructor & 2. Bodyguard (85)
- ⇒ Installers / Technicians / Consultants (87)
- ⇒ Security doors, windows & equipment (88)
- ⇒ As above (*No Knowledge*) (90)
- ⇒ Wholesaling, control room controllers, installation of sec. equip, sales & advisers (93)
- ⇒ As is now!! (97)
- ⇒ Separate electronic services from manned services (101)
- ⇒ Armoured car / large value valuable escort requires special endorsement (103)
- ⇒ Installers - sales - admin - control rooms (107)
- ⇒ All need review - crowd controllers/bouncers are not security (108)
- ⇒ As for 36 (*i.e. Crowd control / alarm installers / control room operators*) (109)
- ⇒ There should be special probationary licenses for crowd controllers should be on P. plates until 21 years (112)
- ⇒ For holders of PIV, CCS, sec officer, security firm & SO1. 1 special license to cover. I have all these & no room in my wallet - (too many cards) (113)
- ⇒ As on P. 1 (120)
- ⇒ Marketing - leadership - correct approach to the industry (122)
- ⇒ Crowd control (125)
- ⇒ Licensing needs to cover two areas, fit & proper persons & competency, are they trained, qualified & competent to do the job? (128)
- ⇒ Body guard (VIP) work (129)
- ⇒ Installation of security systems (130)
- ⇒ Cash in transit, patrol officer, bodyguard, static guard, dog handling, crowd controller, private investigator (131)
- ⇒ Locksmiths (132)
- ⇒ Consultants - tertiary (?) background. Night club door attendants (140)
- ⇒ Weapons (141)
- ⇒ I only know about locksmiths and they should have separate license (142)
- ⇒ Installers, manufacturers (143)
- ⇒ Should not apply to manufacturers & installers (QBSA does that) (146)
- ⇒ Physical security such as locksmiths, alarm installers, security door & screen installers should be categorised (See WA system) (149)
- ⇒ Guard & Patrol Services & Electronic Security Systems (151)
- ⇒ Nil (153)
- ⇒ Security door installers - locksmiths (155)
- ⇒ Locksmiths / crowd control / security officer / alarm installer / and so on (156)
- ⇒ See earlier comments (*notes for separate items see 43*) (157)
- ⇒ CCTV monitoring, systems sales/consulting (158)
- ⇒ Please see the WA or NSW legislation (161)
- ⇒ Security & investigation are different (162)
- ⇒ Generally the need for people in a position where they have access to restricted areas need to be licensed accordingly. The problem is that many people in the industry claim to be something and they are not. Serious action needs to be taken (165)
- ⇒ Weapons (173)
- ⇒ In house security (176)
- ⇒ Inhouse as compared to external security companies (182)
- ⇒ Locksmiths, alarm installers, security advisers, security equipment installers (183)
- ⇒ As training would not be necessary for all areas the categories would be needed to identify specialist training modules.(184)

- ⇒ Crowd controllers; security providers; private inquiry agents (185)
- ⇒ Similar structure to drivers licence. One licence with various categories (188)
- ⇒ As per Q. 7, 9, 10 & 11 and Classes described in Q. 13, 14 & 15 (189)
- ⇒ As detailed – must have separate lic. for traffic (192)

38. Please describe any loopholes that you are aware of in the Act.

- ⇒ Unlic workers are now duty managers, greetors, etc (1)
- ⇒ Unsure (3)
- ⇒ Unsure (5)
- ⇒ What Act?? (8)
- ⇒ Any person can get a security license sign their car and price cut (12)
- ⇒ Not aware of specifics of Act (23)
- ⇒ No requirements for licensing "in house" staff (25)
- ⇒ Unsure (28)
- ⇒ Only covers guards (29)
- ⇒ No license required at present (31)
- ⇒ Still there is security firms not aware of the law and its usage (33)
- ⇒ As above for Q 36 (*some too young + are unable to gain respect*) (34)
The problems involved in the Liquor Industry, in relation to enforcement staff employed at licensed premises has not been resolved under the act. The situation has simply been moved into the security industry whereby individuals involved in enforcement duties simply go under the name of security guards, and violent confrontations come under the heading of "security". Many security companies particularly in the medium to large categories, are using individuals as sub-contractors to overcome costs in relation to remuneration, equipment, and licensing. The situation, is such in many cases, whereby the onus for compliance with the act is placed solely on the individual contractor, including commitments relating to the training licensing and remuneration of staff engaged by these subcontractors for the duties of mobile patrols and static guards etc. Many of these subcontractors are not engaging licensed personal nor providing required training, or in some cases suitable individuals. In many cases commitments are not being met in relation to workers compensation and basic wage payments. (35)
- ⇒ Not enough space (36)
- ⇒ There is no law about "security dog" training or trainers (39)
- ⇒ More attention & policing of wages payments (41)
- ⇒ Far too many to mention - See QSA new draft (Call 07 - 3209-6000) (44)
- ⇒ No criminal code prior to students conducting courses (46)
- ⇒ The major one is to obtain a quickie NSW license then transfer to QLD. Licenses granted prior to Act - no checks, no training. Corporations (patrol/guard services) are providing personnel to companies on a consultancy basis, who in turn "hire" the personnel on direct contracts! (53)
- ⇒ There are too many people working security screen businesses that are unlicensed (55)
- ⇒ Q 7,8,9,10, &11 (56)
- ⇒ Only licensed & recognised security firms using licensed (only) installers should be permitted to install security devises (i.e. alarms) not electricians (57)
- ⇒ Psychiatric evaluations + lie detector use for employing staff (59)
- ⇒ Should be a police check - not just credit check (65)
- ⇒ No organisation actually enforces the Act (66)
- ⇒ Unlicensed bouncers still working but given the title of "host" (68)
- ⇒ Non enforcement of the license conditions (70)
- ⇒ Don't know (79)
- ⇒ None (80)
- ⇒ Unsure (81)
- ⇒ Lack of follow up of Consumer Affairs: It is purely a revenue raiser for Govt (87)
- ⇒ As above (*No Knowledge*) (90)
- ⇒ Still not controlled enough (need licenses) (91)
- ⇒ The current Act is not broad enough to cover all aspects of the security industry (93)
- ⇒ Persons convicted of an offence are not reported to CAB (94)
- ⇒ Criminal records should be better checked (97)
- ⇒ License holders going to court and not having it recorded (100)
- ⇒ Don't know (101)
- ⇒ Supplier of guard dogs don't need to be licensed (104)
- ⇒ Anybody can work in the industry (107)
- ⇒ Security are inclusive of glass and bar easy. managers. (108)
- ⇒ The whole Act is one BIG loophole if its not enforced: Definition of what is security is not broad

- ⇒ enough (112)
- ⇒ Know of some with SO1 with no clients?? Too easy for some to get SO1 (113)
- ⇒ Many loopholes - but that is for experienced operators to detect (122)
- ⇒ Any one without a criminal record can get a license (125)
- ⇒ None that I know of (126)
- ⇒ "Glassies" working as crowd controllers (128)
- ⇒ The use of 'glassies' / PR personnel as security providers Untrained employees within 'in house' security (131)
- ⇒ Not aware - but it is not adhered to (132)
- ⇒ Unknown fully of Act (140)
- ⇒ In security door and window industry there are so many unlicensed providers that there is disrepute as in shoddy and work fitted not as per grade (152)
- ⇒ No enforcement or checking of the application of the Act (153)
- ⇒ People applying for a traineeship with a security firm and if not successful claiming discrimination if they have a criminal record (156)
- ⇒ The split of crowd controller away from Security officers (161)
- ⇒ Transportable licenses (162)
- ⇒ I am not fully conversant with the Act (165)
- ⇒ Unlicensed crims working as duty managers etc (173)
- ⇒ Allowing inhouse operative to work unlicensed (176)
- ⇒ Is silent on alarm / lock installers There are many examples of "crooks" working in the industry, getting jobs installing locks and alarms and going back and robbing the place (183)
- ⇒ Unable to comment (184)
- ⇒ See attached (*Copy of "Central City Licensing Management Committee Report, 16 June 1997 Presented to Police Commissioner, still waiting to be acted upon, funding*) (185)
- ⇒ No demand name/address provisions, no provision for place to check security registers (186)
- ⇒ None (189)
- ⇒ None (191)
- ⇒ Officers charged/convicted after issue of licence & continue to work (192)
- ⇒ Employment of unqualified people by shonky operators (193)

39. If you don't think that Consumer Affairs should administer the Act, which government unit should and why?

- ⇒ Police with a board from sec ind (1)
- ⇒ Dept of Justice (3)
- ⇒ Dept of Justice (4)
- ⇒ unsure - should be specialised group (5)
- ⇒ Police minister's office (6)
- ⇒ The Justice Department This Dept has closer ties with the requirements of the industry (7)
- ⇒ No - Police as per W A Security Agents Act (8)
- ⇒ They just do their job that's all (12)
- ⇒ Police -> nexus between security & police should be strengthened this might be one way of doing it (17)
- ⇒ Dept of Justice, appropriate legal authority (18)
- ⇒ Police, due to close nature of the working environment and the need for similar skills in some aspects of this work (21)
- ⇒ Minister for police (23)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs relates to trading & commerce Justice Dept should administer (25)
- ⇒ Police dept Criminals need to be kept out and only police can do this (26)
- ⇒ Control board see QSA submission (27)
- ⇒ Someone with more force (28)
- ⇒ Police (29)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs plus a delegation from industry (30)
- ⇒ Police service (31)
- ⇒ I do not believe the "act" is in the appropriate legislative organisation (33)
- ⇒ Police + Emerg Services (34)
- ⇒ Queensland Police Service Queensland Consumer Affairs does not carry the physiological impact in the minds of individuals intent on not complying with the act (35)
- ⇒ Under Control Board made up of INS Council, police, minister dep, law society + industry (36)
- ⇒ The Police (39)
- ⇒ OK to administer, needs more efficiency (44)
- ⇒ A body of people attached to consumer affairs, but are experienced operators within the industry

- should investigate and control the industry (46)
- ⇒ A separate body containing industry, justice & law enforcement reps (50)
- ⇒ The industry should administer the act under the guidelines of + accountable to the QCA (53)
- ⇒ Consumer affairs are a useless organisation! A private company should be hired (55)
- ⇒ A justice dept with communication/access with con-affairs (56)
- ⇒ Police consultative association set up to improve security/police liaison (59)
- ⇒ Police - and government protected - with power to detain (65)
- ⇒ Justice Department It has a direct link with the industry (66)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs could still administer the Act if they start to enforce regulations and their officers were taught the Act, as no one in this Department understands it (68)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs should administer the Act However they should conduct the appropriate criminal checks and should follow up on all complaints of persons or companies working unlicensed Their field officer need to work shift work and they need more of them (69)
- ⇒ Police Dept Western Australia has probably the best Security Act & Licensing (70)
- ⇒ CJC (72)
- ⇒ Police should have greater input (73)
- ⇒ Police, obvious (74)
- ⇒ Dept of Justice & police Justice can follow up (if they are willing or allowed to do so) on police reports (75)
- ⇒ Self regulation (80)
- ⇒ A new security commission (81)
- ⇒ None - added costs, paperwork, we are all over regulated (83)
- ⇒ Queensland Police "Weapons Branch" (85)
- ⇒ Department of Justice - It's a law issue not real estate (86)
- ⇒ It should be self regulating through the QSA, with a Government "Security" Dept overseeing the administration (87)
- ⇒ Police - (88)
- ⇒ All Consumer Affairs does is demand money when your license is due!!! (92)
- ⇒ A federal dept , as this would allow national security checks on proposed personnel & companies etc (93)
- ⇒ Police service (97)
- ⇒ Have the industry do it They know the industry No pen pushers (98)
- ⇒ Police Dept Co-operation between essential services (99)
- ⇒ Police - it does not take long to ask a c/c for I D (100)
- ⇒ Don't know (101)
- ⇒ Leave well enough alone - currently seems OK! (103)
- ⇒ Policeforce (more aware of industry) (105)
- ⇒ Good quest? + Who has the time + resources (106)
- ⇒ Justice Department (107)
- ⇒ Police should same as Weapons Act (108)
- ⇒ Definitely not the Police departments of each State (109)
- ⇒ The Police Dept, direct cross referencing with other licenses (110)
- ⇒ AG's (111)
- ⇒ It wouldn't matter who did it as long as it is done properly Police are just as bad for non-enforcement of (112)
- ⇒ Police - They have resources & able to freely ask for production of license more often on street (113)
- ⇒ Liquor Licensing Division - (for crowd controllers) since this would make the crowd controller liable for failing to provide proper supervision of patron's I D checks (116)
- ⇒ Department of Justice - re criminal history (118)
- ⇒ A part of the police service - they are more in touch with the whole aspect of security & what it entails & are "on the street" so to speak, as are the security personnel (119)
- ⇒ Dept of Tourism & Racing (120)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs - but Sport Racing and Tourism I think are better (122)
- ⇒ Because their officers finish at 5pm and security are operating after this time (124)
- ⇒ I think it should be independent (125)
- ⇒ Police Department in conjunction with Consumer affairs with field officers to police the Act (126)
- ⇒ Justice Dept better service (127)
- ⇒ A board with at least 50% industry representation (128)
- ⇒ Specialist security industry licensing body (129)
- ⇒ Any Govt unit is appropriate providing they are granted the resources to perform & they do perform At present this is not occurring (131)

- ⇒ A board of industry should endorse application (132)
- ⇒ I don't know if BSA wouldn't have more skills in this area (134)
- ⇒ Police Dept Function is crime prevention (135)
- ⇒ A separate administration with skilled people in the field (136)
- ⇒ I believe the Consumer Affairs Dept quite adequate (140)
- ⇒ QLD Police (141)
- ⇒ Self regulation (142)
- ⇒ Police or similar (145)
- ⇒ A licensing system as set up by WA government is administered (*sic*) by a branch of the WA police dept, and on the whole works well (149)
- ⇒ An element of the QPS. They have the database and the power to close breeches (*sic*) (153)
- ⇒ Police/Attorney General (154)
- ⇒ Police Department (156)
- ⇒ Dept. of Justice - Justice a crime prevention focus should have a higher priority than licensing matters (158)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs or the Police (161)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs OK. (162)
- ⇒ In conjunction with D of Justice (163)
- ⇒ Justice Department (164)
- ⇒ I think a joint partnership should be maintained between the Consumer Affairs and a Department which monitors crime i.e. CJC etc. (165)
- ⇒ Local police to area you work in (173)
- ⇒ Police. ensures full information always available on staff (criminal) activity (175)
- ⇒ Justice Department (176)
- ⇒ Agree with Consumer Affairs (179)
- ⇒ Queensland Police Service, It works well in NSW (181)
- ⇒ Justice & Police (182)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs are okay. Could possibly be Police Security Liaison Board. (183)
- ⇒ No comment (184)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs should be properly resourced and trained (185)
- ⇒ Police - licencing commission investigators (186)
- ⇒ Justice Department (189)
- ⇒ Need group consultation. Perhaps Department of Justice or Dept of Tourism etc (193)
- ⇒ OK if Consumer affairs is resourced. Maybe the Dept of Justice (194)
- ⇒ Do an okay job – could be improved (195)

40. Can you suggest any amendments to improve the Act or the regulations?

- ⇒ Get rid of grey areas i.e. crowd controllers only in lic.d areas (1)
- ⇒ Remove deprivation of liberty law enforcement (3)
- ⇒ Again what Act (8)
- ⇒ Look at past history/jobs (9)
- ⇒ As answer 37 (*No self employment until 2 years as guards*) (12)
- ⇒ Include electronic security industry (13)
- ⇒ Include security installers (14)
- ⇒ no (15)
- ⇒ Increase the State's liability for the action of licensed officers and at the same time free the State up to withdraw licenses as it sees fit (17)
- ⇒ A total review nationally to produce AS standard (18)
- ⇒ no (20)
- ⇒ No - have not seen act (23)
- ⇒ License all providers of security (25)
- ⇒ See QSA submission (27)
- ⇒ Take it further to locksmiths (30)
- ⇒ The regulation should state that the basic principles of law should be a course for all security guards to take regardless of education level (33)
- ⇒ Better Screening (34)
- ⇒ Total rewrite with consultation with industry (?) (36)
- ⇒ Proven prior learning should be exempt for licensing e.g. MP or police (39)
- ⇒ See Q 38 (*Far too many too mention - See QSA new draft*)
- ⇒ A standard price structure for provision of services (46)
- ⇒ Need the power of detention for at least 60 mins or until police arrives without fear of repercussions (48)

- ⇒ Must tie licenses to training requirements (national competencies) (53)
- ⇒ not really (54)
- ⇒ I feel in our industry you should have to carry a license to buy materials for security screens (55)
- ⇒ Broader to cover entire security industry practitioners (56)
- ⇒ It is too easy to start a security firm - this should be tightened up to stop all the undercutting in the industry & shonks The RTO is enforcing the abolishing of contractors - the Act should ensure a level playing field before doing this (57)
- ⇒ Deregulation of certain awards to people with little experience (59)
- ⇒ Your joking Should have the power to detain (not citizen arrest) (65)
- ⇒ Develop an enforcing organisation (66)
- ⇒ All persons working within the industry need to be licensed (68)
- ⇒ As per WA/NSW (70)
- ⇒ Re write with a lot more input (72)
- ⇒ Better and more intensive practical training (75)
- ⇒ See 36 (*Have not heard of the Act so can't respond*) (79)
- ⇒ no (80)
- ⇒ Unsure (81)
- ⇒ A single license covering all aspects (86)
- ⇒ Get rid of the bureaucracy and get serious (87)
- ⇒ No (90)
- ⇒ Each security company must lodge a security bond before they are licensed (94)
- ⇒ No (101)
- ⇒ A common "Code of Conduct" should be drafted & made legally binding! (103)
- ⇒ Make security firms more accountable for the service they provide Such as mobile patrols Very few firms provide the correct number of inspectors (104)
- ⇒ Allow those with SG3 licenses to own weapons but not compulsory (106)
- ⇒ Government legislation (107)
- ⇒ Only security with 2 years experience be allowed to sub contract (108)
- ⇒ Rewrite with involvement of the security industry (109)
- ⇒ Do it again and consult with everyone this time and not just the chosen few from multi practicals (112)
- ⇒ Vehicles need to be more recognised Bar light fitment - due to specific task - currently illegal to fit (113)
- ⇒ No (121)
- ⇒ No discounting A price fix (general) (122)
- ⇒ Higher standard of training (124)
- ⇒ No just police them to stop short cuts (126)
- ⇒ No (127)
- ⇒ No (128)
- ⇒ Tighten up compliance through more rigorous inspection (129)
- ⇒ Better enforcement Greater ongoing consultation with the industry (131)
- ⇒ Again needs to read fully the act (?) (140)
- ⇒ Have not read the Act because it does not apply to l/smiths (141)
- ⇒ Have not seen the Act (148)
- ⇒ No (155)
- ⇒ Best explored at a discussion seminar (157)
- ⇒ Throw it away and refer to the WA or NSW legislation (161)
- ⇒ No (164)
- ⇒ Unable to comment The Queensland Security Association needs to be disbanded and moral and ethical people put in charge No one in it is at the moment (165)
- ⇒ Get real on enforcement and work when c/controllers work (173)
- ⇒ As above no 38 (*i e Allowing inhouse operative to work unlicensed*) (176)
- ⇒ Nil (179)
- ⇒ Look at WA and NSW Acts (183)
- ⇒ If wish to achieve a secure industry it needs to include licensing for other security services i e alarm installers, locksmiths (184)
- ⇒ See attached (*Copy of "Central City Licensing Management Committee Report, 16 June 1997 Presented to Police Commissioner, still waiting to be acted upon, funding*) (185)
- ⇒ See 38 (*No demand name/address provisions, no provision for place to check security registers*) (186)
- ⇒ Higher policing authority of firms/officers (187)
- ⇒ As per previous submission dated (189)

⇒ Have you got half a day!! (192)

41. Can you suggest any strategies for improving industry compliance with the spirit of the Act?

- ⇒ Proper enforcement by authorities & proper penalties (1)
- ⇒ inspectors to visit & talk to the guards (3)
- ⇒ Further training of currently licensed guards (5)
- ⇒ Relieve Consumers Affairs dept of responsibility (6)
- ⇒ As above (*Again what Act*) (8)
- ⇒ Night time checks on guards (12)
- ⇒ no (15)
- ⇒ Holding a license should be a privilege bestowed by the state, not a right for having completed a course The onus should be on the holder to prove beyond doubt that they are fit to hold & continue to hold a license Having held a license should not imply a right to continue to hold a license (17)
- ⇒ Compliance with AS O-M 9002 series (18)
- ⇒ no (20)
- ⇒ as above (*No - have not seen act*) (23)
- ⇒ as per attached (25)
- ⇒ See QSA submission (27)
- ⇒ Governing body (31)
- ⇒ no! (33)
- ⇒ More powers (34)
- ⇒ Proper Act + appropriate for (?) (36)
- ⇒ Perhaps a rep from consumer affairs can get on the road to ID guards (38)
- ⇒ Inspectors need to be active to catching so + cc breaching the law SPA (39)
- ⇒ Public awareness program re license requirement (42)
- ⇒ Industry involvement (43)
- ⇒ Improve the spirit of the Act + communicate with the industry (44)
- ⇒ More contact with the industry on an individual basis (47)
- ⇒ Dog handlers & their dogs used in the industry for search & secure be registered by Consumer Affairs (does not include compound dogs) (48)
- ⇒ Greater investigation powers, prosecution & manpower to carry out same (50)
- ⇒ Greater industry pressure therefore Dept Com Affairs needs to work with industry more seriously (53)
- ⇒ Fine people that are not licensed and manufacture shonky work (55)
- ⇒ State licensing (56)
- ⇒ Compliance checks should be done by a special task force to ensure the Act is being followed They should specifically target one man operations & shonky companies who continually undercut to get jobs De registration should be a penalty (57)
- ⇒ Licenses + associated fees based on competence review increased (59)
- ⇒ Increased auditing of security companies by Consumer Affairs (63)
- ⇒ Industry training and auditing (66)
- ⇒ All legitimate persons in the industry need to work together instead of against each other to have undesirables [*sic*] removed (68)
- ⇒ More field officers are needed and they need to work at the times when the industry is working i e nights (69)
- ⇒ Random audits by licensing body (70)
- ⇒ See 36 (*Have not heard of the Act so can't respond*) (79)
- ⇒ no (80)
- ⇒ Set standards, tough registration & authorisation (81)
- ⇒ Making A/S real standards not a joke (82)
- ⇒ No (83)
- ⇒ Business integrity should be a consideration (84)
- ⇒ "Code of Practice" (85)
- ⇒ Enforce it without exception and heavily penalise offenders (87)
- ⇒ No (90)
- ⇒ More inspectors and more companies with IR issues (94)
- ⇒ Better courses - more content - better instructors (97)
- ⇒ People bring c/c, s/d should be able to find info about sec firm (100)
- ⇒ No (101)
- ⇒ Firearm registers need more frequent inspection visits / or checks (103)

- ⇒ Random or by the complaint of anyone auditing security firms for the (1) use of unlicensed persons, (2) failure to provide services contracted, (3) payment of award wages (104)
- ⇒ More control of firms entering the industry (105)
- ⇒ A better body to keep check on all companies including national co's (106)
- ⇒ ASIAL involvement (107)
- ⇒ Check staff (108)
- ⇒ Regular statutory audits of requirements (110)
- ⇒ Start enforcing with penalties (112)
- ⇒ Should be a minimum fee for statics & patrols - very cut throat & bodgy (113)
- ⇒ No (121)
- ⇒ Keep inferior operators out of the industry An accord should be set up (122)
- ⇒ The forming of an (Internal Affairs) Policing the Act (126)
- ⇒ No (127)
- ⇒ Stronger policing of the Act (128)
- ⇒ Media campaign re using only reputable companies (129)
- ⇒ Field audit system should be put into place by Consumer Affairs (130)
- ⇒ Greater auditing by inspectors & imposing fines (131)
- ⇒ Involvement of specific industry in drafting legislation (132)
- ⇒ Fines and Penalties like NSW SPIA (141)
- ⇒ All security providers eg doors windows etc should be registered (no backyard) (152)
- ⇒ Close association with professional industry organisations (153)
- ⇒ Audits (154)
- ⇒ No (155)
- ⇒ See comments (*notes for separate items see 43*) (157)
- ⇒ Requires cultural shift, establishment of localised Codes of Conduct - plain English version of the Act outlining what is expected (158)
- ⇒ Co-regulation with an industry body (161)
- ⇒ You need Inspectors to check on Companies & ascertain who is not complying (162)
- ⇒ No (164)
- ⇒ Companies should be monitored for breaches At the moment there are companies or businesses that do not even exist in the Tax Office's records There are too many shonky operators who have no regard for the law (165)
- ⇒ Investigate companies - interview staff (166)
- ⇒ Make venue owners & managers responsible for who they employ (173)
- ⇒ Regular audits (174)
- ⇒ None (176)
- ⇒ Nil (179)
- ⇒ Set up a regulatory body (183)
- ⇒ Not at present (184)
- ⇒ Effective audit and enforcement capacity within Consumer Affairs (185)
- ⇒ Audit requirements (186)
- ⇒ An investigative authority (active) to ensure compliance with Act & investigate legitimate 'complaints (187)
- ⇒ No (189)
- ⇒ More inspections – particularly in country area Stiffer penalties for non conformance (192)
- ⇒ Qualified individuals should be employed by the department who controls Need regular visits to premises (193)
- ⇒ More regular checks on premises and inspections (194)
- ⇒ Better regulation and enforcement (195)

42. Fines for breaches of the Act are \$7,500 for individuals and \$37,500 for corporations. Are these appropriate? If not, what should they be and why?

- ⇒ Fines are okay but who is going to have the balls to give them (1)
- ⇒ yes (3)
- ⇒ these are appropriate (5)
- ⇒ yes (6)
- ⇒ Should be higher for quote accountability (7)
- ⇒ yes (8)
- ⇒ yes (9)
- ⇒ yes (10)
- ⇒ They only work if you catch them (12)
- ⇒ no ten times worse to act as deterrent (15)

- ⇒ yes (16)
- ⇒ Yes. Relative to the punishments given for other Acts, the fines are probably too high. Withdrawal of licenses should be the primary method of control rather than fines. Loss of income from losing a license would be punitive enough for individuals. Acting w/o a license should be treated as fraud (17)
- ⇒ No - amounts too small (19)
- ⇒ Appear appropriate (20)
- ⇒ OK (22)
- ⇒ as above (*No - have not seen act*) (23)
- ⇒ yes (26)
- ⇒ Who enforces ?? (27)
- ⇒ yes (28)
- ⇒ Yes (30)
- ⇒ Yes, no breaches are enforced (31)
- ⇒ do not know (32)
- ⇒ They are appropriate (33)
- ⇒ Higher to become more reputable (34)
- ⇒ Existing fines are more than adequate. Individuals or corporations prepared to breach the act under existing penalties would not be deterred by further increases. Individuals or corporations guilty of inadvertent or minor breaches that attract excessively heavy fines would not be consistent within what may be perceived as an already heavily regulated or possibly over regulated industry. (35)
- ⇒ Don't know what you are talking about The question is incomes (?) (36)
- ⇒ A lot less \$1000 individuals \$37500 for corporations (37)
- ⇒ Yes, but no one is been charged!! (39)
- ⇒ As a 1st fines its OK - as a 2nd fine breach's Double fine for individual with 1 month of training at the individual expense and corporations double + 2 months training at their expenses to every member of the company - as 3rd license to be cancelled/fine of \$60000 & the person should never again be associate on any way at all with the industry (40)]
- ⇒ yes (42)
- ⇒ refer QSA new draft (44)
- ⇒ yes (47)
- ⇒ yes (49)
- ⇒ Presently very few are prosecuted thus no fear or fines exist (50)
- ⇒ Yes, if ever seriously applied. But who takes it seriously (not Dept Consumer Affairs) (53)
- ⇒ I think 7,500 for individuals is a bit strong for someone who may not be aware of some parts of the Act. (54)
- ⇒ yes (55)
- ⇒ Appropriate if being applied (56)
- ⇒ Corporations should not necessarily be penalised 5 times more than an individual who would more than likely breach the Act on purpose. A corporation may inadvertently breach the Act but would get a higher penalty for a mistake (57)
- ⇒ Appropriate (59)
- ⇒ yes (60)
- ⇒ OK if it has been investigated (62)
- ⇒ appropriate (63)
- ⇒ Yes they are appropriate (64)
- ⇒ Like license another form of tax (65)
- ⇒ Fines are appropriate they just need enforcing (68)
- ⇒ They are adequate, they just need to be enforced (69)
- ⇒ y (72)
- ⇒ Not sufficient should be significant fines (73)
- ⇒ No opinion (74)
- ⇒ The fines for individuals are appropriate. Those for the corporations however. Remember they are watching millions go \$\$ (75)
- ⇒ yes (77)
- ⇒ See 36 (*Have not heard of the Act so can't respond*) (79)
- ⇒ yes (80)
- ⇒ yes (82)
- ⇒ Far too high. The government does not need to fine individuals & corporations, the fine should = 0 (83)
- ⇒ Yes (84)

- ⇒ Yes - But what is the use if no one is "fined" (85)
- ⇒ yes (86)
- ⇒ Double them: To stop the laughable situation that currently exists (87)
- ⇒ Yes (90)
- ⇒ Financial hurting people does not solve the problem (92)
- ⇒ Corporation fines are OK, but are they enforceable - Just try & track down some nightclub owners (93)
- ⇒ Sufficient (96)
- ⇒ Yes (97)
- ⇒ Fines are an easy answer, not solving problem (98)
- ⇒ Yes (101)
- ⇒ Yes, appropriate (102)
- ⇒ Would appear adequate (103)
- ⇒ These fines are fine but Corporate Affairs has to start enforcing the Act. Something they have failed to do for many years (104)
- ⇒ Yes (105)
- ⇒ \$10,000 & \$100,000 (107)
- ⇒ They are useless when not enforced (108)
- ⇒ Yes (109)
- ⇒ Yes (110)
- ⇒ It doesn't matter if no one is out there checking to see if there are any breaches There's no scrutiny from anyone What a joke (112)
- ⇒ Yes (113)
- ⇒ Appropriate (114)
- ⇒ Fines are too high - particular in their early stages - offences are more likely to occur from ignorance or an honest mistake (119)
- ⇒ Yes (120)
- ⇒ Yes (121)
- ⇒ Appropriate (122)
- ⇒ Appropriate (123)
- ⇒ Yes (125)
- ⇒ Appropriate but will probably never given by Magistrates who all seem to be in the rehabilitation mode today (126)
- ⇒ Yes (127)
- ⇒ Yes appropriate (128)
- ⇒ Yes (129)
- ⇒ To ensure compliance individuals \$20K corporations \$50K (130)
- ⇒ Yes they are appropriate, however they are a token gesture at present due to the fact that they are not enforced (131)
- ⇒ Yes (135)
- ⇒ Satisfactory - depending on the type of breach (136)
- ⇒ Yes (138)
- ⇒ Yes (139)
- ⇒ Unsure: I believe it may depend on severity of breach (140)
- ⇒ See above (*Fines and Penalties like NSW SPIA*) (141)
- ⇒ Yes (144)
- ⇒ Yes (145)
- ⇒ Yes (147)
- ⇒ Satisfactory (148)
- ⇒ Yes (151)
- ⇒ Yes (153)
- ⇒ OK (154)
- ⇒ Yes (155)
- ⇒ Probably appropriate. It is up to the judiciary/Consumer Affairs to impose the appropriate fine (157)
- ⇒ Yes - Stiff fines are part of the message to the industry that the community expects professional service (158)
- ⇒ Yes (159)
- ⇒ Just give the relevant dept. the teeth to enforce the Act (160)
- ⇒ Fair (163)
- ⇒ Yes (164)
- ⇒ The fines are appropriate but will never be effective because the right people will never get caught.

- How can you fine someone if they are not supposed to be operating (165)
- ⇒ Not enough - companies still find loopholes - no enforcement \$50,000 minimum (166)
- ⇒ Yes (167)
- ⇒ Fair (?) (168)
- ⇒ Fair (?) (169)
- ⇒ Yes but who ever will be caught or fined (173)
- ⇒ We need to be proactive Fines are a means of stopping breaches however they need to be taught the effects of their actions (174)
- ⇒ Appropriate (176)
- ⇒ Agree (179)
- ⇒ Yes (181)
- ⇒ Yes (182)
- ⇒ Appropriate Mo magistrate gives max penalty anyway (183)
- ⇒ Adequate (184)
- ⇒ Cannot comment (185)
- ⇒ Who cares - court decides (186)
- ⇒ Appropriate (189)
- ⇒ Double the amounts in the least for individuals and triple for corporations (191)
- ⇒ Should be double (192)
- ⇒ Appropriate if policed properly (193)
- ⇒ Appropriate if enforced (194)
- ⇒ O K (195)

43. Any other comments on any aspect of the Act or its administration are welcome.

- ⇒ The Act was necessary to establish control over the security industry in Queensland, which up until the time of inception of the Act, was in a disorganised state and consisted of undertrained personnel and numerous security organisations of dubious character This comment is tempered by the fact that a number of the security organisations did provide some level of training and offered external courses to others who desired to improve their standards The compulsory training required for all security officers under the provisions of the Act since 1993 has been of significant benefit to the industry and has raised knowledge and skills standards generally I feel it is time that the training aspect of the Act and the definitive recognition of the various security organisations is given some thought with a view to further clarification The Act groups all security organisations in a similar vein in that, it assumes all security organisations perform similar work This assumption has led to a training programs being developed which, in the case of this University, is totally useless The Act should examine the various forms of security providers and their charters and make the necessary distinction Briefly, there is the private sector driven by profit and the Government and semi-government sectors driven by service and financed by specified budgets The two have entirely different philosophies and are different both in missions and concepts To explain my comments I draw your attention to the Training Program at the University of Queensland for security personnel The program is in three stages The first stage is a five day theory program as detailed in the attached schedule Stage two is a three week practical program where the new member is trained and supervised by another member of Security in the systems around Campus Stage three involves further advanced training such as the Law Module as detailed in the enclosed schedule and Advanced Level of First Aid training The University Security Service is also a multi-operational service It operates a diverse monitoring station incorporating CCTV, plant, fire and security alarms, electronic reporting systems, includes mobile, foot and lockup patrols on our Campuses, plans and provides consultancy services for access control and intruder alarm systems and is heavily involved in safety awareness, first aide and fire prevention programs All Security Personnel are multi-skilled and able to perform in any position within the security service This concept is marginally different to many other security organisations who may only specialise in one field I believe our training, Standards and Operational Procedures far exceed the requirements of the Security Providers Act and provides for a high professional level of service within the security industry However, our Charter is different to other organisations as we specialise in the Tertiary Education Sector of security It is this point I emphasise should be addressed in any future changes to the Act (7)
- ⇒ Are we going to regulate our lives to fit in with government policy? Let free enterprise be free of regulations, fees, licenses, and a government that thinks it knows better than those who do the work and charge us for the privilege (11)
- ⇒ Car licenses have a provisional period why not guards Some guards are stealing from clients and Consumer Affairs gives them a license to do so Can you stop the overnight price cutting cowboys (12)
- ⇒ The Act doesn't seem to address electronic security installations there is no regulation on who may install a security system or who may provide monitoring services Owners have no assurance

- their system will provide the protection expected (13)
- ⇒ Why do NSW have installers license and not QLD (14)
 - ⇒ I'm not sure that "security" should be honed off as a specialist area. It doesn't require you to be a brain surgeon. "Security" licensing should be part & parcel of more jobs which deal with the public and difficult clients i.e. receptionists, librarians, teachers, bank tellers, all bar staff, shop assistants, really anyone who monitors areas open to the public or deals with cash or valuables
(note next to item 33) What is this for? If the State licenses someone, they should take responsibility, in part for the persons actions. This is a general weakness to the government's approach to licensing. If the gov approves a license, it should face a higher liability than if it takes a laissez-fair approach w/o licensing. Thus if the State licenses firms, it should provide the prof indemnity (17)
 - ⇒ As per para 39 above (*Dept of Justice, appropriate legal authority*) (18)
 - ⇒ My point at that time (when the Act was introduced) was that *all* providers of security should be licensed. In regards to the Retail sector I made the point that it was that particular sector which is more exposed to litigation for unprofessional conduct than any other sector due to the fact that they deal predominantly with the public and are one of the few segments of the "industry" which actually apprehends or detains suspected offenders. I am afraid, judging from my sources still in the industry that little has been done to improve its professionalism, only a properly controlled system of licensing will improve it. Moving on to the public sector, my views are not much different. Within the public sector you have the State Government Security Service, Hospitals, Railways, other Government employees, some with statutory powers, Universities? Section 4(3)(c) of the Security Providers Act (1993) define an officer or employee of the Commonwealth or a State or Territory as *not* being a security provider in carrying out the functions of the person's employment. My argument is what in fact are they? To support my argument, allow me to revisit previous dialogue of which we have engaged in, i.e. problems within the industry per se. Serious lack of attention and inadequate training at all levels of private security was a major factor identified in the Rand Report. Many government agencies outsource and utilise commercial organisations, persons from those agencies are/should be licensed, however my questions are, (a), are the standards high enough? (b), is the level of supervision of a consistently high enough standard? Different public sector organisations require different levels of coverage depending on the complexity of their operation, some are highly technical, others are human resource intensive, others in addition are extremely sensitive. There is at the moment a new direction rearing its head in so far as security is concerned, viz facilities management. I note the large number of Building Supervisors gaining prominence which combines all facets of a large range of services, from cleaning, maintenance through to safety and protection. From a safety and risk management perspective, unless there is a clearly defined *minimum* standard of competency of both training and supervision, then the risk is unacceptable. In my view, the most acceptable bench mark of competency is licensing to an approved standard based on the Australian Standards – AS 4421 – 1996 (Guards and Patrol) and CS-FP 001 – 1995 (Fire and Emergency Response). Following on from the basic core skills specialist endorsements as you have recommended in our questionnaire would be appropriate. I note with interest you have mentioned Control Room operators, this I believe is a specialist skill. Consider the technologies involved in modern control rooms, with access control, building automation systems, fire systems and CCTV monitoring. Irresponsible CCTV monitoring has caused much aggravation in the past, in New South Wales the Privacy Commissioner, Mr Chris Puplick has had much to say about the matter, so much in fact he has the potential to impose very restrictive constraints on this facet of the industry and intends to do so. Fortunately he is not in this State. Therefore if a person was found to be irresponsible in CCTV monitoring a worthy censure would be loss or suspension of license. I invite you and your team to visit the Cultural Centre's control room, it is very high tech and an indication of an operation which monitors a wide range of services and is continually expanding. For a person to become competent in the operation of such a facility, a great deal of training is needed, however, following that training, usually on the job, they have no record or statement of proficiency. A person who is either totally incompetent or is guilty of irresponsible or intrusive CCTV monitoring can at the moment move from site to site, claim they are proficient on control room equipment and then be let loose until their short comings are detected or they reoffend, in the mean time they have the potential to cause enormous damage to equipment, plant and reputation. A license would be a safeguard against this. Irrespective of who the provider of security is, either proprietary or contract, I need to be assured that the quality of service is documented in accordance with minimum standards and competencies and controlled by legislation. I submit that the current level of training is inadequate and that prior to being licensed as a crowd controller or private investigator, a person should satisfactorily complete a core or basic security officers course. The basic course should be TAFE level the duration of which should address a wide range of issues and subjects, including ethics and some criminological theories, various elements of law must be clearly understood. Weapons training and licensing should be undertaken by the Police. I fail to see the need for security officers to be

carrying weapons in public areas (where they can't use them) except in high risk situations, and, I don't believe shopping centres fall into this category I realise that by suggesting training at TAFE level many of the current providers of such training will bitterly react but by lifting the standard of training and the provision of such this will flow on to the industry itself Remove this portfolio from the Consumer Affairs Department and place it under the Justice Department Have the Justice Department liaise with TAFE and higher education authorities and the Police, for them to formulate a minimum basic or core course, then work with different professionals in the industry to establish stepped levels of training for specialist endorsements (25)

- ⇒ Its a mess
(Note next to item 29) Won't work
(Note next to item 35) Better system (27)
- ⇒ The present Act need to cover all people in the security industry locksmiths any person that handle any part of security & peoples safety (30)
- ⇒ (Note next to item 18) Police check only
(Note next to item 35) Yearly (31)
- ⇒ we are not a security company (in telephone directory, listed under Security Systems and Consultants) (32)
- ⇒ As stated above there should be a TAFE course on law not diploma level and regardless of education level to teach security guards about the law and its principles for apprehending suspects or offenders preserving the peace whilst on duty (33)
- ⇒ The situation pertaining to the training of suitable applicants for the security industry in general is a major concern Many accredited training facilities, due to their inherent commercial nature are virtually taking people off the street and without suitable screening, or in fact any screening whatsoever, other than a name and address are inducting these individuals into a training program that provides a knowledge of security procedures, physical restraining methods and even weapons handling and training The only criterion for the acceptance into the program would appear to be the appropriate fee, and in many cases this is being taxpayer funded
Many individuals are no doubt of an unsuitable nature for consideration into the industry, and no doubt individuals with a prior criminal history and even active criminals have availed themselves of this opportunity to gain first hand knowledge of security practices and hands on weapons training (35)
- ⇒ Contact Queensland Security Association for their recommendations (36)
- ⇒ 1 Dogs used in the industry need to be included in the Act to specify their training requirements
2 The cost per year to re license is not justified compared to other States (39)
- ⇒ This new law should replace the old one so old loopholes can be eliminated
(Note next to item 18) Should have clear records (40)
- ⇒ Registers at venues should not be required if register and appropriate records kept by security firm/provider (43)
- ⇒ Consumer Affairs unable to police the Act - they have insufficient (a) staff, (b) budget, (c) training (44)
- ⇒ Alarm systems + access control systems should be tested by an approved agency e.g UL United Laboratories (45)
- ⇒ The administration of the Act particularly offences is thinly spread "back yard operators" exist in the hundred with no insurance, workers comp and/or acceptable standards Complaints of same are either not actioned or actioned too late to prevent non professional reflection on the industry (50)
- ⇒ I think the public should be made aware of what we are doing to ensure their safety & well-being i.e this Act itself & the industry becoming more regulated & licensed to weed out shonks & conmen also a license category for locksmiths & security systems (54)
- ⇒ There is no standard (in our industry) that people have to abide by when manufacturing security screens Therefore many times firms do them as cheap and nasty as possible leaving the consumer unaware their security screens are not reliable when it comes to protecting them & their property making it extremely difficult to the person who quotes on manufacturing a security screen that is to a very high standard (55)
- ⇒ I have been on the executive of numerous security associations such as ASIAL, QLD Sec Assoc for many years lobbying politicians to regulate the security industry entirely and the best the Gov could come up with was crowd controllers - disappointing to say the least (56)
- ⇒ One of the biggest problems security providers have is in the alarm installation area any person can install alarm systems - even criminals (past - present & future) another problem is installations by electricians - this is our industry not theirs (see Q38 (Only licensed & recognised security firms using licensed (only) installers should be permitted to install security devices (i.e alarms) not electricians)) - many electricians put in alarms etc for the dollar value not for what they should do or how they operate - this should be addressed (57)
- ⇒ We are not involved in the type of security describe in the Act & are not familiar with the Act We

- are involved with windows & door security & suggest that all manufacturers should be licensed with the police as in WA (58)
- ⇒ All I can say is that I was assaulted by a crowd controller personally in a night club for no reason about 5 weeks ago and was hospitalised and still suffer from this I was hit repeatedly for no reason and I am still contemplating taking legal action against this nightclub (61)
 - ⇒ We have no power to detain - police and public treat us as dirt - that's why I have selected clients that I can look after by myself - Every time you change this Act our license goes up When I first started was \$100 now over \$600 You never see anyone only pay us that is (?) You would have to be crazy to employ To get the right person is very hard - I've given up trying (65)
 - ⇒ As the Act does not impact on daily operations, opinions expressed are based on general feelings rather than direct experience 1 license nationally must be the goal (67)
 - ⇒ A minimum price per hour needs to be set This is not price fixing, but when you have companies tendering on jobs at as low as \$8 00 per hour, persons in the industry cannot expect to receive award rates of pay (68)
 - ⇒ Licensing in other States has not really worked except maybe WA (72)
 - ⇒ Home security company's should also be included in the Act This is in fact the case in Western Australia with standards under police license (73)
 - ⇒ Sorry, I couldn't be of more help As discussed I've never seen this Act & my business doesn't include dealing with most of your questions (76)
 - ⇒ Have never heard of the Act (79)
 - ⇒ none (80)
 - ⇒ The Act should not be expanded My view is that the fees paid for licenses pay for the administration of collecting the fees and produce higher costs for operating a security company (83)
 - ⇒ 1) Security & crowd control licenses should be merged to "Security Officer" only 2) Bodyguard license introduced (85)
 - ⇒ There appears to be a misinterpretation in that a security officer who is not a licensed crowd controller cannot escort any staff on a work site I do not call this body guarding, yet under the act it does (86)
 - ⇒ I am a member of ASIS (American Chapter) only, as the corruption in ASIAL & ASIS in Australia is pathetic Self interest and feathering of their own nests are applicable to 90% of the people involved
(Note next to item 17) Please, please, please
(Note next to item 31) Definitely not its a joke (87)
 - ⇒ I strongly believe the above category 37 (*security doors, windows and equipment*) needs a licensing of some form I am aware they have some in place in WA (88)
 - ⇒ In our business we are required to be registered with the building services authority which we are but most other security businesses this does not seem to be enforced (*sic*) (89)
 - ⇒ With security doors & screens the customer is the person that dictates in our business Can't see how this comes under this Act the building industry would laugh (90)
 - ⇒ Existing companies should be interviewed and accessed New operators must be tested before being licensed (91)
 - ⇒ K I S S (93)
 - ⇒ The Act has in most cases formalised what the big companies were already doing Now there are still many companies (usually small) that pay lip service to the Act and to industrial relations and award payments (94)
 - ⇒ My firm is not involved in the security industry except to replace glass after break-ins (95)
 - ⇒ It's worth the board's time to look at Prosec Security courses conducted from 1986-1993 Good content - well run - good instructors - Mostly ex Police Good results (97)
 - ⇒ Yes Set standards and enforce these standards (101)
 - ⇒ Limit should be placed on number of people doing training courses There are too many unemployed security officers because (a) they were not suitable material before training & were only marginally better after training (b) there are not enough jobs to employ current numbers, yet more are being pumped through training centres every day (102)
 - ⇒ Before the Act, licenses were issued when a company offered employment and became void on termination therefore licenses matched vacancies - now exists a 10 to 1 (or more) ratio of licenses to vacancies creating a cut throat market of undercosting the industry and a continual flow of failed one man security businesses and poor quality services
(Note next to items 7-11) Licensed no course reqd But police checks done (103)
 - ⇒ More emphasis should be placed on on the job training rather than in school environment e g working under someone be before granted a full license (104)
 - ⇒ I feel that Consumer Affairs does not have enough (105)
 - ⇒ Cash in hand and under award wage is rampant Nearly all Surfers Paradise night clubs are now cash in hand and in house Legitimate companies no longer run the books or control staff (108)

- ⇒ It's pointless to have Acts & reg if they're not enforced it wouldn't matter which dept had control
Employers are easily circumventing the act and employing people without licenses through inhouse tactics Calling workers glass cleaners hospirtality creators fashion police Retail industry get round it very easily also and employ unlicensed people
(Notes on front of questionnaire) You haven't given this enough time and you haven't circulated very well
You may choose to circulate this survey to a greater portion of the industry There are many problems you have only touched the surface Particularly Gold Coast ask the workers
(Note next to item 8) Should be abolished
(Note next to item 12) More info
(Note next to item 30) Doesn't matter who does it if you don't give it 100%
(Note next to item 32) Many are (112)
- ⇒ Needs to be a provision that security companies providing patrol services must have a car that is clearly marked & is in good condition - there are some really horrific patrol vehicles Provides a bad image
(Note next to item 34) For employees (113)
- ⇒ Good knowledge of hospitality practices should be considered, as in our case, a security/door man is the customer's first impression of the business they are getting into (115)
- ⇒ Unfortunately the industry has been invaded by novices that think its easy they are slowly bringing the industry down We need a Standard of Experience, Commitment and Money (122)
- ⇒ When the government brought in licenses it stopped a lot of good security people Now you have a lot of (wanna bees) running around with a tag on (125)
- ⇒ We saw how the CJC Police Dept has the Internal Affairs Branch There are no field officers on the street with authority to check on the industry We require one if we are going to control all we have at the present time is the collection of fees by the controlling bodies (126)
- ⇒ (Note next to item 22) Not on basic course
(Note next to item 23) Not on basic laws (127)
- ⇒ I am Queensland Director of the Master Locksmiths Association of Australasia and serve on a board for over 300 member companies throughout Australia We are in favour of licensing for locksmiths but it must be structured to benefit the community Eric Higgs (132)
- ⇒ We simply manufacture doors & grilles - no idea what you're on about with licenses etc (137)
- ⇒ Too many "Cowboys" setting themselves up as locksmiths without any qualifications (141)
- ⇒ Have not seen a copy of said Act Locksmiths should be separate to all other security workers
(Note next to item 27) None - Locksmiths are totally different workers to alarm installers and shouldn't be lumped with them for convenience (142)
- ⇒ Have not seen copy of the Act, therefore are not in a position to answer above questions (143)
- ⇒ All applications for locksmiths should be tested and graded by the Master Locksmiths Association (148)
- ⇒ An in depth look at the West Australian system would give you a good basis from which to start I feel that the poor response from locksmiths was probably due to your lack of information about trade based licensing as opposed to manual security
(Note next to item 12) Provided physical security is not mixed with trade based
(Note next to item 29/30) This would not be required if administered by Police Dept) (149)
- ⇒ As I know little or nothing about Crowd Controller, Private Investigator, Security Officer or Security Firm I cannot comment on Questions 36-42 inclusive (150)
- ⇒ Unable to offer detailed concerns as do not have any involvement with training for security officer All personnel required to be licensed before offering employment (154)
- ⇒ See attached letter
(Note next to item 8) HOWEVER At what level "in-house security officers" For example, many Government agencies (including Commonwealth) have DSOs (departmental security officers) This is not a full time function but rather a conduit for advice from, for example, ASIO I do not agree that a "guard force" or the like should be formed of licensed individuals trained in guarding, likely scenarios and possible (non-violent) responses
(Note next to item 9) HOWEVER Once again, at what level (or definition) of consultancy? There are many professional security consultants who have received in-house professional training over a period of time from organisations/agencies such as ASIO, RAAF, RAN, ARA etc Such consultancies provide 'intellectual' advice which enables corporations and/or governments to make better informed decisions At this level there is, I do not believe, a measure of suitable consistency about which a license system for such companies should be fairly initiated Companies or persons at this level will succeed through appropriate and tested advice
Consultants providing either 'hands on' surveys (household, small business etc), advice in respect to technical security or support or provision of a guard force etc, should, I believe be licensed and receive some form of appropriate training about which there is some degree of uniformity and professionalism within the industry

- (Note next to item 10) There should be uniformity, consistency and an ability to react appropriately in what is potentially a repetitive, frustrating and potentially life saving situation
- (Note next to item 11) But be careful of level If intellectual, the companies with credibility are those with representatives with credibility Companies at the lower market end may employ less experienced representatives
- (Note next to item 12) A good concept
- (Note next to item 13/14/15) I would think this is highly inappropriate Compare with training in Commonwealth are military/intelligence/security areas where specialised training is over an extended period and on specific subjects for example interviewing skills, body language, recruitment, negotiation, etc Surveillance course in one Commonwealth agency is 3 months long and basic investigations course is 5 weeks I would think to be able to control a crowd with least confrontational methods would take longer than 24 hours, similarly for investigators and security officers
- (Note next to item 17) It is imperative that persons providing security related advice, internal security/guarding and installing security related equipment be of high integrity and honesty This would, I believe, help in the way
- in which the industry is perceived Criminal History checks to be conducted in all states in which applicant has resided If uncheckable background, applicant should not proceed to licensing
- This aspect is less critical for those persons working supervised and in say, the area of crowd control However, a person who is violence prone (arrests for assault etc) should not be placed in this area of work as there is an increased likelihood of unnecessary violence to members of the public The area of crowd control at nightclubs is one such area with a bad reputation for assaults Another aspect might be in the less than satisfactory training on dealing with situations in other than a confrontational way
- (Note next to item 18) While vetting checks do provide a means of establishing a person's character, three testimonials from 'reputable' persons would accomplish little An applicant would only forward those testimonials which reflect favourable A better resolve would be to provide 3 referees Two personal and one work related This would provide better opportunity for a skilled interviewer to elicit relevant information re the applicant
- (Note next to item 27/28) I would hazard a guess and say not!!
- (Note next to item 29) As the responsible administering authority, the Dept of Justice should be making suitable and appropriate recommendations re the departments within its ambit
- (Note next to item 30) Either Dept of Consumer Affairs or the Police Department (as with issuing of weapons license)
- (Note next to item 33) Inappropriate advice from security firms could have devastating effects on small (or large) business - especially in respect to client confidence Similarly, inefficient guarding could result in major asset loss (though one would assume that a business would have appropriate insurance)
- (Note next to item 34) Not security related A matter for industrial relations
- (Note next to item 35) Inappropriate and unnecessary Perhaps licenses renewed annually, criminal checks initiated at renewal Again, is this totally necessary? (157)
- ⇒ The Act & associated licensing has lead to substantial improvements in the industry There is clearly however still a long way to go Of particular interest is the need for enhanced focus on non-violence amongst crowd controllers & the need for confidentiality, responsibility & reliability in staff monitoring CCTV screens (158)
- ⇒ That only people holding a security providers license should be allowed to train (161)
- ⇒ In Q'ld you must train & then be licensed this eliminates Companies having trainees License holders from other States are not aware of State laws & there is no requirement for them to learn
- *What about backyard unlicensed operators being used everyday by Insurance Companies and Solicitors Regulated companies can't compete price wise!!
- (Next to item 1) Ha! Ha! (162)
- ⇒ The security industry in Queensland or at least in Brisbane is a joke Many companies are run purely for a front and the security aspect of the company is disregarded due to 'clients' going for the cheapest quote and thus encouraging unscrupulous and shonky operators Performance is only a secondary consideration, and therefore the job is not done properly
- (Next to item 34) Unions are the only people who are supposed to carry out such checks However their agenda seems to be purely a membership based one They will look the other way if it is worth their while What is needed is a professional body who monitors awards The current awards have no relevance what so ever to the current working conditions of employees In most cases it is counter productive for the people it is supposed to protect The guards themselves need to be consulted (165)
- ⇒ (Note next to item 7) Provided that initial license would be issued based on competency & experience as opposed to formal training (170)
- ⇒ (Note next to item 30) Perhaps Police Services
- (Note next to item 35) May be expensive to do

(Note at bottom of page) Please read these responses in the situation that our Public Sector Agency has very little day to day contact with the security industry. We are accommodated in a building owned by the QLD government and our security is essentially managed by the SGPSS of the Dept of Works and Housing (171)

- ⇒ An issue not addressed by your questionnaire is crowd controllers being allowed to continue work even though they may be the subject of criminal investigation, for example an assault against a patron. Many persons like myself (an in-house security manager) strongly feel that such persons should have their license suspended pending the outcome of the investigation and or court proceedings.
The questionnaire is directed at venue managers when a number of larger hospitality establishments have in-house security departments who may be in a better position to comment on security providers. (172)
- ⇒ Listen to the industry and let someone or some group who know the industry and the loopholes do the admin or at least the investigation work (173)
- ⇒ *(Note next to item 13)* More required (182)
- ⇒ A review taking place this year. Need to look at WA and NSW. QLD should be mirrored on WA. NSW took it one step further.
(note next to item 6) Need to go further
(note next to item 12) Need to model on NSW
(note next to item 16) Standardised competency training.
(note next to item 31) To a point (183)
- ⇒ *(note next to item 4)* Need to go further
(note next to item 12) One licence with the categories noted on it
(note next to item 16) Could be more competency based. Minimum standard set by Weapons Branch. Weapons Branch has a course structure/content that must be used by training organisations for a license to be granted. Standardisation important
(note next to item 17) There are four categories that disqualify a person for 5 years (DV, assault, drugs and alcohol...)
(note next to item 24) Knowledge of law in our section is adequate (184)
- ⇒ I am of the view that Consumer Affairs are the appropriate body to enforce, regulate & audit the persons subject to the Security Providers Act. The enforcement is not core business of the QPS and should not be tasked to that agency
(note next to item 1) Has the potential if certain provisions are in place
(note next to item 16) No need to train crowd controllers in weapons, should be no need to use them, should be trained in conflict resolution skills
(note next to item 35) Requirement on security firm to advise if a member of the firm is involved in any criminal investigations
(note next to item 37) All should be separate
(note next to item 39) Consumer Affairs needs to be given more authority
(note next to item 43) Keys are: accountability, adequate training and resourcing of Consumer Affairs; Liaisons with police (185)
- ⇒ Crowd controllers are the front line with regard to interactions with public. They need more training
(note next to item 1) Problem with crowd controllers is that they are "frontline" and need to be trained in areas such as conflict resolution
(note next to item 39) Consumer Affairs is just handing out licensed, and is not monitoring the industry (186)
- ⇒ No further comment (189)
(note next to item 1) Should include traffic controller (192)