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Abstract

This study identified a grounded theory related to ethics in security management and ethics studies within graduate organizational security management programs in the United States. The study used data analysis of program curricula, course descriptions, and program websites, as well as interviews of program faculty and administrators to explore (1) how ethics studies are incorporated into graduate organizational Security Management program curricula in the U.S. and (2) how educators in graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe their definitions of ethics in security management, the role that ethics play in security management as a practice and as a profession, the role that ethics studies play in graduate organizational Security Management studies, instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies within their programs, difficulties in teaching ethics, and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum. The research findings resulted in the creation of a theoretical model for ethics in security management emphasizing a balance between various personal and professional factors. In addition, the findings resulted in a model for the role of ethics in organizational security, which is based on trust, and combines security’s heightened authority and access to information with increased exposure to potential ethical decisions, which result in significant personal, organizational, and professional consequences for ethical failure. The research findings also resulted in the creation of theoretical models depicting ethics studies in graduate Security Management programs and the role of ethics studies in the professionalization of security.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

On any given day, organizational security managers must be prepared to guard against and respond to a myriad of unethical acts by organizational employees. Ethical issues such as employee theft, internal fraud, data access abuses, and bribes for insider information plague organizational security officials, and tarnish company reputations. For example, during 2010, organizational security managers responded to a highly publicized employee data access abuse at Google (FoxNews, 2010) and a $1 million bribery scandal at Apple (Carey, 2010), while earlier in 2009, security managers attempted to minimize some of the internal fraud that caused a 5% loss in annual revenue among American businesses (ACFE, 2010). These are just a few of the unethical acts by employees, which organizational security managers must attempt to prevent and investigate within the American workplace.

Security managers must make ethical management and security decisions during (1) the investigation of ethics violations, (2) the protection of organizational personnel and assets, and (3) the planning and coordination of crisis responses (McCrie, 2001). Poor ethical decisions by security managers could result in security breaches, failed crisis responses, and other unethical behaviors, which threaten organizational stability, and increase an organization’s potential civil liability (Fay, 2006; McCrie, 2001).

While ethical actions and ethical knowledge are of prime importance to the day-to-day practice of security managers, ethics and education provide the foundation for security management’s progress toward acceptance as a profession. Security professional bodies such as the American Society for Industrial Security (ASIS International), the International Foundation of Protection Officers (IFPO), and the Security Institute, are actively working toward enhancing the professional reputation of security management. Since two primary determinants of
professional status are ethical standards and education (Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Simonsen, 1996; Rogers, 2000), security professional bodies would benefit from further insight into security ethics, security education, and the intersection of the two areas.

In addition, the host of business ethics violations throughout the last 20 years has spawned a renewed focus on ethics studies within business education (Collins, 2006; Datar, Garvin & Cullen, 2010; Ketchum, 2010; Swanson & Fisher, 2008). Given the similarity between organizational security management education and business education (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Holladay, 2003) along with organizational security’s status as a core business function (Holladay, 2003; Nalla, 1996), and security management’s role as investigators of business ethics violations (McCrie, 2001), one might expect organizational security educators to follow the lead of business educators by emphasizing ethics studies in security management education.

Indeed, trends within comparable graduate management programs, enhancement of security’s professional status, and good security practice all reinforce the importance of ethics studies within organizational Security Management education programs. However, few, if any studies have explored the prominence of ethics education in organizational Security Management graduate education or explored security management educators’ opinions regarding the role of ethics education to security management as a practice and as a profession.

**Significance of the Problem**

Although the total number of personnel in all security positions in the U.S. is unknown, researchers approximate that the ratio of security industry personnel to public law enforcement personnel is three to one (Cunningham, Strauchs, & Van Meter, 1990; Ray & Hertig, 2008). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) (2010) reported that security guards alone in the U.S. exceed
1,076,600, and protect 85% of the U.S. infrastructure (Ray & Hertig, 2008). Those security officers are supervised by security managers and security executives who often use graduate education in security management to prepare for the rigors of managing security personnel and programs within organizations. Failure to incorporate ethics studies in those graduate organizational Security Management programs may result in a legion of security managers and security executives who fail to identify potential ethical concerns, or consider the ethical repercussions of their actions.

One can only imagine the negative repercussions if such a large security officer force, many of whom are armed, and who have access to vast infrastructure, are supervised and trained by managers and executives with no understanding of ethical management or ethics in security. Thus, graduate organizational Security Management programs preparing students for security management careers have a duty, like their business school counterparts (Ketchum, 2010), to prepare security management students for the numerous ethical dilemmas they will face as employees, as managers, and organizational ethics representatives.

This research furthers the aims of security’s professional organizations through enhancement of the body of work related to two key aspects of professionalism in security: education and ethics. In addition, the numerous security professional organizations such as ASIS International, the IFPO, and the Security Institute have a vested interest in whether organizational Security Management programs are attempting to provide potential members with the requisite knowledge to understand and abide by their required codes of ethics (ASIS International, 2011).

Additionally, ASIS International and the Security Executive Council have created guidelines and standards describing the key characteristics necessary of security executives, and
key facets of security executive positions (ASIS International, 2008; Security Executive Council, 2011). The standards and guidelines emphasize ethical knowledge as key characteristics of security executives and key requirements of security executive positions (ASIS International, 2008; Security Executive Council, 2011). The research might assist organizational Security Management program administrators identify shortcomings in the academic preparation of security managers in meeting the ethical requirements of the published standards for security executives. Additionally, ASIS International has made progress toward the creation of a security program accreditation body (ASIS International, 2010). Given the emphasis on ethical knowledge as a key aspect of security management, the proposed security accreditation body would likely benefit from enhanced understanding of the current state of ethics studies in security programs in order to develop realistic expectations for security programs hoping to gain accreditation.

The research also provides programs, many of which have the goal of preparing students for careers in security management, with a tool to better prepare students for the security management board certification exam, which includes ethics questions (ASIS International, 2011a). Security management students may also benefit from the frame of reference that this study provides, by which students can evaluate the standing of ethics studies in a potential degree program compared to other graduate organizational Security Management degrees. Finally, this study provides information regarding program administrators’ perceptions of the importance or lack of importance of ethics studies in their programs. Such information may provide insight into some possible future directions of organizational Security Management education especially regarding ethics studies.
Practical and Intellectual Goals

Maxwell (2005) described personal goals, practical goals, and intellectual goals, which drive and influence research. One personal goal associated with this study relates to the attraction of conducting research into an area that was previously unexplored, which will perhaps facilitate the future publication of peer reviewed articles.

As any field continues to grow, researchers must study its progress, and inconsistencies that may affect its future growth and status. As a security instructor, one practical goal is that this research helps promote the systematic progression of security management as a field of study and instruction. As a security professional, the practical goal is to improve the professional status of security managers through emphasis on ethics.

Unfortunately, the unexplored facets of ethics in organizational security management significantly outnumber the aspects that have been touched upon. Simply put, security researchers have not even established baseline research into ethics in organizational security management education. Thus, one must begin research in this area with what Maxwell (2005) would describe as foundational, overarching intellectual goals related to ethics studies in security programs:

Intellectual Goal 1: Understand the role that organizational Security Management program administrators perceive regarding the interrelationships between ethics, education, and security management as a practice and profession.

Intellectual Goal 2: Understand the overall state of ethics studies in graduate organizational Security Management programs and the overall trends related to the teaching of ethics within graduate security management classes.
Research Questions

When conducting qualitative research, one should consider asking central questions supplemented by several sub-questions (Maxwell, 2005; Creswell, 2007). The central or overarching research questions are listed below.

1. How do program description materials show that ethics studies are being incorporated into graduate organizational Security Management program curricula in the U.S.?

2. How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe (1) their definitions of ethics in security management, (2) the role that ethics play in security management as a practice and as a profession, (3) the role that ethics studies play in graduate organizational Security Management studies, (4) instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies within their programs, and (5) difficulties in teaching ethics and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum.

The purpose of the first question is to gain understanding of the overall state of ethics studies in graduate organizational Security Management programs, according to available program materials. This will provide information for comparison against existing research into ethics in other management related graduate programs. The purpose of the second question is to ascertain the context, situation, and definition of ethics studies to program administrators and instructors. Administrators’ perceptions of the role of ethics education may provide an indication of future directions for ethics studies in security management programs.

Study Organization

The remainder of the study lays a foundation, evaluates and discusses the extant literature, details the research design for this study, reports findings, and revisits the literature
with discussion. First, the study will cover the two theoretical frameworks, which provide the foundation for this study, and help refine the assumptions therein. Next, the study reviews the literature relevant to security management as a practice and a profession, while incorporating relevant literature into business ethics education, all through the lens of the common good approach to Corporate Social Responsibility and the neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s moral development theory. The research design is then discussed, which includes a description of the participants, methodology, and protection of human subjects. Finally, the results are reported, and later discussed in the context of the literature.
Theoretical Framework

The first theoretical framework covers the common good approach to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as the justification for the need for ethics knowledge and ethical actions within organizations not only at strategic levels, but among line workers and managers such as security officers and security managers. The second framework uses Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory as a foundation, but applies a neo-Kohlbergian approach to the theory. Thus, the neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development will be used as the lens through which this study views the ethics education within organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S. One might say that CSR is used to consider why ethics are needed in the practice and the neo-Kohlbergian approach is used to consider ethics education in building a profession.

Whether the specific title is business security, asset protection, organizational security, or corporate security, the security component is a core business function (Holladay, 2003; Nalla, 1996). As such, the study of ethics in organizational security should start with exploration of business ethics. According to Schmidt and Boncella (2007), business ethics is a normative field of ethics, which involves identification of actions considered morally right or wrong within business situations. As a normative field of ethics, business ethics researchers attempt to research what constitutes ethical conduct within a business context, or what businesses should do to be ethical. Cross and Miller (2001) described three normative theories of business ethics: Shareholder Theory, Stakeholder Theory, and Social Contract Theory.

Jean Jacques Rousseau might say that the bedrock of a free society is the social contract, which preserves individual freedom while maintaining social order (Wraith, 2008). In a business context, Social Contract Theory is also often referred to as CSR theory, and it will be
one foundational element for this study. Although this research is specifically built off the “common good” approach to CSR theory, several other groups of CSR theory exist.

**CSR Theory: A Framework for Ethics in Practice**

The study of CSR traverses across several theories, each containing subgroups, which are considered to be approaches to CSR theory. Garriga and Mele (2004) identified four groupings of CSR theories. **Within instrumental CSR theories**, the corporation is viewed solely as an instrument to create revenue. According to instrumentalism, social activity is acceptable only if the activity facilitates creation of wealth. Thus social activities by the business only occur to create profit. **Political CSR theories** focus on the responsible use of power, especially within the political arena, by businesses in society. Political theorists emphasize the corporation’s acceptance of social duties and rights. **Within integrative CSR theories**, businesses are expected to focus on the satisfaction of social demands. According to integrative theory, businesses must integrate social demands because businesses depend on society for existence and growth. **Ethical CSR theories**, which are a framework for this research, are based upon presumed ethical responsibilities of corporations to society with the understanding that businesses should prioritize social responsibilities as an ethical obligation above other concerns.

**Ethical CSR theory.** Four approaches to ethical CSR theory exist: Normative stakeholder approach, universal rights approach, sustainable development approach, and the common good approach. The normative stakeholder approach to CSR theory emphasizes the responsibility of businesses to tend to the interests of all appropriate stakeholders in society as well as the individual firm’s stakeholders. Proponents of normative stakeholder theory justify the theory through arguments derived from Kantian capitalism (Bowie, 1991; Evan & Freeman, 1988), modern distributive justice theories (Donaldson & Preston, 1995), and the focuses of
freedom, rights and consent exhibited in Libertarian theories (Freeman & Philips, 2002). Universal rights approaches to CSR are important since human rights are considered to be a basis for CSR especially given the global nature of many businesses, and their effect on human rights, labor, and the environment (Cassel, 2001). The next approach to CSR theory, sustainable development, began with the United Nations 1987 publication of the *Brutland Report*, and it demands a relevant corporate contribution to society (Garriga & Mele, 2004). The *Brutland Report* emphasized the goal of sustainable development as a method by which to meet current needs without compromising needs of future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

**The common good approach to CSR.** The final approach to CSR, and a primary lens by which this study is viewed, holds the idea of the common good, with its Aristotelian roots (Smith, 1999), as the foundation for CSR (Mahon & McGowan, 1991; Velasquez, 1992). Although easily confused, the common good approach to CSR is not synonymous with John Stuart Mill’s utilitarian ethical theory, which claims that the moral worth of an action is determined by the degree to which the action results in the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Although the common good approach takes into account individual good, it emphasizes the individual’s placement as a piece of an integrated network of social relationships as opposed to the individual constantly at odds and in competition with other members of society (O’Brien, 2008).

Indeed, the common good approach to CSR emphasizes the individuals’ interdependencies and placement as social beings that thrive within a social network. The common good approach is based on the premise that success of a community equates to increased well-being of community members. Thus, members of society acting together for the
good of society are acting in society’s best interests and in their own best interests because society and the individual benefit from society’s success (Jordan, 1989; Kaku, 1997).

Within the business context, the common good approach emphasizes that business, like every other individual or organization within society’s web of interdependencies, should contribute to the common good. Fort (1996, 1999), thus argued that business should be considered a mediating institution and that it should only positively contribute to society, and not harm society. Business contributes, or should contribute to the common good through creation of wealth and efficient provision of goods and services while upholding fundamental rights of individuals in society.

Although several ways of interpreting the notion of the common good exist (Sulmasy, 2001), Garriga and Mele (2004) proposed an interpretation of common good based on the knowledge and fulfillment of human nature. Indeed, business contributes to commerce, which often facilitates peaceful and friendly living conditions for those within a community (Mele, 2002). Alford and Naughton (2002) suggested that businesses and the managers therein are not a political community and thus are not directly responsible for the common good. However, they added that businesses and their managers have their own common good, and as such, are responsible to the common good of the wider community.

The common good approach is historically applied to the political community and government actions (Alford & Naughton, 2002), and is not without its opponents, especially within business. The common good approach to CSR is contrary to the liberal assumptions of Adam Smith and Milton Friedman who emphasized that individual pursuit of self-interest result in the greatest good for society (Dorrien, 1990). Jensen and Meckling (1976) also offered a compelling argument against CSR when they mentioned that most organizations exist as
imaginary entities, which only serve as a conduit for a set of contracts between people. How can one thus ascribe social responsibilities to an entity that is in essence a legal fiction?

One might understand resistance to CSR theory and the common good approach within corporate America since capitalism in America was built off Smith’s emphasis on individual pursuits resulting in a greater good for society. Additionally, managers who apply a purely profit-based motive for businesses will find the results to be easily quantifiable through mathematical analysis, with little grey area for success or failure of a business. Indeed, one could hardly argue some of the values of a financial emphasis within a business. A financial emphasis seeks to ensure that shareholders receive fair returns through financial techniques controlling costs, and increasing efficiency (Koslowski, 2002).

However, Alford and Naughton (2002) asserted that such a strict emphasis on finance reduces all relationships to simple financial exchanges, thereby distorting business operations. Financial exchanges then become the global priority of the firm emphasizing maximization of profits. Thus, finance shifts from one of the necessary and primary functions to manage economic dimensions of a business into the normative position of all business. As such, the discipline of finance becomes the sole determining factor in how a business ought to operate (Alford & Naughton, 2002; Perrow, 1986). However, financial considerations consist of only a single function of an organization, and the entirety of an organization’s work can hardly be reduced to only one function (Alford & Naughton, 2002; Drucker, 1974).

Regardless, the blind pursuit of individual wealth by corporate executives and resulting corporate scandals have caused some people to question Smith’s assertion that pursuit of self-interests automatically leads to a stronger marketplace and the good of all (Hollenbach, 1996). What place does the idea of the common good have in the business world? One must simply
consider business scandals such as Enron, Worldcom, and HealthSouth to recognize that the sole pursuit of self-interest does not always garner the best results for individuals, much less the organization. Society is showing increasing levels of distrust for business institutions and the common good should be considered in business not only because it is better for the society in which the business operates, but because failure to contribute to the common good will only damage an organization’s reputation (Naughton & Alford, 2002). Indeed, Fraedrich, & Ferrell (2005) noted that ethical behavior is positively associated with customer trust, organizational reputation, and customer satisfaction, which all have a positive impact on financial performance (Collins, 2006).

One must also caution against the dangers of managers operating strictly from profit-based perspective since such blind financial pursuits cause significant, and often unfounded hostility within society toward corporations (Drucker, 1974). One type of manager in particular, the security manager, must not approach all management based decisions from a profit-based perspective. Although security managers consistently weigh cost versus benefit of security measures, and consider the likelihood of risk and the consequences if an incident occurs in their formula for security decisions, the core function of organizational security management is always protection of life and promotion of the overall common good through security and safety of the organization and the people within.

Viewing this research through the lens of the common good approach to CSR creates an expectation that businesses and their security managers should indeed take steps to promote the common good and CSR as part of standard business practice. This research was conducted based off the assumption that businesses and individual security managers have a responsibility to contribute to the common good, whether it includes making an ethical management decision
or funding additional costly security measures. Thus, one might expect graduate programs in business and organizational security, which educate those security managers, to take measures to educate future security managers on ethics. One must then ask how students might develop morally through ethics education.

Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development: A Foundation for Further Development

Kohlberg, who is perhaps the most well-known moral development theorist, used Jean Piaget’s developmental work as a foundation. Piaget viewed the progress of logical reasoning as a series of stages in which individuals take into account additional variables as they progress (Crain, 1985; Lozzi, 1990). Kohlberg asserted that moral development is the enhancement of a person’s ability to apply the perspectives of other people as well as themselves when faced with moral decisions, and advances in moral reasoning are said to provide people with the ability to understand abstract concepts and consider complex perspectives (McDaniel, 1998).

Kohlberg’s model is based on an underlying focus on social justice and democracy as the foundation for his moral stages. Kohlberg’s theory of moral development can be divided into four distinct segments: (1) The cognitive development approach to development, (2) The explanation of the development of moral judgment, (3) Identification of stages of moral judgment, and (4) Emphasis on cognitive conflict and social interaction as tools for advancing moral development (Reimer, Paolitto, & Hersh, 1983).

The cognitive approach to development. As previously mentioned, Kohlberg extended the work of Piaget, who developed a two-stage view of moral development as part of his initial cognitive development research to determine how children orient themselves to the social world (Selman, 1971). However, Piaget only assessed children between the ages of six and 12 years (Crain, 1985; Piaget, 1965; Reimer et al., 1983). Piaget found that younger children regarded
rules as fixed, while children who reach the ages of 10 to 12 often view rules simply as tools, which can be changed for the greater good, and are used by people to maintain order (Crain, 1985; Piaget, 1965; Reimer et al., 1983). Piaget attributed the children’s differing logic to advanced development among the older children as part of a capacity to make sense of the world in which they live. Piaget determined that the different forms of reasoning were age related, and thus fell into stages of development (Reimer et al., 1983). However, Piaget never completed his work by formalizing beyond his two stages of moral development before returning to his work on cognitive development stages in children. One of the primary facets of Kohlberg’s theory was his application of Piaget’s concept of stage-based cognitive development to a stage-based model of moral development. However, before Kohlberg’s stages of moral development can be discussed, Kohlberg’s concept of moral judgment must be explored.

**Development of moral judgment according to Kohlberg.** Kohlberg’s concept of moral judgment is primarily concerned with a person’s decision making process to determine which value he or she believes takes precedence during a moral dilemma (Reimer et al., 1983). A person activates his or her moral judgment when a moral dilemma creates disequilibrium. This disequilibrium creates a conflict within the person’s value system. For instance, a person might weigh the value of honesty against the value of living up to his or her family’s expectations when faced with the opportunity to cheat on an important exam. The person must then decide to do one of two things: (1) accommodate the problem to his or her way of thinking or (2) accommodate his or her way of thinking to the problem in order to create equilibrium again. As part of this process, the person prioritizes his or her values, and quite possibly re-prioritizes those values based on the scenario. Dilemmas requiring moral judgment thus force a cognitive process
requiring us to determine our values, weigh against one another, and create a hierarchy (Reimer et al., 1983). Kohlberg compartmentalized moral judgment into stages (Kohlberg, 1969).

**Kohlberg’s levels and stages.** Kohlberg followed Piaget’s criteria for cognitive stages. Kohlberg’s stages differ from one another qualitatively. Additionally, Kohlberg’s stages are structured wholes, which means that responses to moral dilemmas are general patterns and not specific responses (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983). Kohlberg also believed people progressed from one stage to the next in an invariant sequence, meaning that people cannot advance more than one stage at a time (Kohlberg, 1971a). In addition, Kohlberg believed his stages were hierarchically integrated, which means that people do not lose the ability to consider scenarios from perspectives consistent with a lower stage of development (Kohlberg, 1969). Finally, Kohlberg believed his stages were universally sequential, which means that they applied across all cultures (Kohlberg, 1981).

Kohlberg’s six stages are divided into three levels, with two stages making up each level. The Pre-conventional level, which is the lowest level, is characterized by a person’s interpretation of right and wrong based on values associated with punishment or reward (Kohlberg, 1971a). During stage one, physical consequences of a person’s actions are the sole determinants of right and wrong. Additionally, people operating at stage one do not make decisions based off moral order, but based off avoidance of punishment. During stage two, moral action is determined based off self-centered needs, with occasional consideration for the needs of others. Kohlberg (1971) described human relations, at the second stage, as viewed from a market place model, with elements of fairness and reciprocity present, but interpreted in a pragmatic way.
Stages three and four make up the next level: the Conventional level (Kohlberg, 1969). Individuals at the Conventional level emphasize the expectations of family, community, or peer groups, regardless of immediate consequences. This group-emphasis comes from loyalty to the group and to the maintenance of group dynamics as opposed to a simple to desire to conform (Kohlberg, 1971). People in stage three act to please or help others. Stage three is where people begin to place value on the intentions of others (Kohlberg, 1971a). A person who genuinely “means well” or exhibits caring is highly regarded by people in stage three. During stage four, individuals are oriented toward authority and maintenance of order. Respect for authority, social order, and duty are highly valued by people at this stage (Kohlberg, 1971).

The highest level, the Post-conventional level, is made up of stages five and stage six. An individual at this level attempts to define moral values that have he or she deems important (Kohlberg, 1971a). These values are no longer determined based off group affiliation or obedience to authority. At stage five, moral action is defined by generally agreed upon standards. People at this stage tend to be aware of the relative nature of personal values. People at stage five emphasize the importance of laws, but also operate with the awareness that laws are a form of social utility, which can be changed through the proper measures, if they do not serve the greater good. The sixth and final stage is one that Kohlberg himself has described as an ideal and possibly unreachable stage. People at stage six make decisions based of self-determined ethical principles emphasizing justice, reciprocity, human rights, and respect for the dignity of others (Kohlberg, 1971a).

**Emphasis on cognitive conflict and social interaction.** Instructors providing moral education have used values inculcation methods in which, instructors simply tell students what they ought to believe (Reimer et al., 1983). Inculcation has been criticized as simply preaching
Kohlberg sought to offer an extension to the often used value clarification model of moral education by providing instructors with alternative methods for students to reach a moral solution to their values conflicts. Instead of simply focusing on defining values, Kohlberg focused on defining the moral perspectives that support those values. While values clarification attempts to make students aware of the values held by themselves and others, Kohlberg sought to enhance the awareness of the moral reasoning that fostered such values (Reimer et al., 1983).

During one study, Blatt and Kohlberg (1975) examined moral education by stimulating students’ advancement through the stages by involving classroom discussion on hypothetical moral dilemmas. During the research, a discussion facilitator induced cognitive conflict by encouraging arguments which were one stage above the level of discussion groups covering moral questions related to sample situations. Students progressed through moral development stages through exposure to views challenging their thinking and forcing students to justify their moral thinking (Crain, 1985). This was the first test of effects of exposing students to cognitive conflict and the next higher moral development stage. The study showed that approximately 33% of the students who were involved in the discussions and exposed to a higher stage advanced the next higher stage of moral development during an academic year. The students in the control group remained at their respective initial stages.

Kohlberg believed his stages to result not from physical maturation or from socialization, but from a person’s thinking about moral problems (Kohlberg, 1968). However, Kohlberg
(1969) would later mention that a person’s social experiences produce conflict, which provides people with the opportunities to consider others’ perspectives, resulting in moral development. When people have their views questioned, they are compelled to work toward more advanced and defendable positions. New moral stages are reached as people advance to broader viewpoints (Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975).

**The Need for a Neo-Kohlbergian Approach**

For decades, Kohlberg was involved in numerous research projects aimed at developing his theory, exploring the role of cognitive development, cognitive conflict, and social interaction, all while incorporating Kohlberg’s viewpoint of moral judgment into a stage-based approach to moral development. However, many of Kohlberg’s research methods and approaches to his theory received criticism not only from a philosophical perspective, but related to his ever-changing research methodologies as well. Indeed, Kohlberg’s focus on justice and rationality instead of relationships (Gilligan, 1982) as well as an extremely limited diversity among research participants has prompted criticism (Reimer et al., 1983). This mounting criticism eventually resulted in what might be perceived as a paradigm shift among researchers regarding the perception of Kohlberg’s theory. Eventually, some researchers viewed Kohlberg’s theory as a foundation, but not the final state. Thus, the neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s theory was developed.

Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, and Bebeau (1999, 2000) introduced a Neo-Kohlbergian approach, which uses primary characteristics of Kohlberg’s theory while adjusting for the many critiques voiced by Kohlberg’s contemporaries. Like Kohlberg, Rest et al. (2000) emphasized the importance of cognition as the foundation for a person’s moral development. Additionally, Rest et al. (2000) focus upon the individual’s construction of values placed upon duty, justice,
reciprocity, and social order within the context of a person’s social experience. Like Kohlberg, Rest et al. (1999, 2000) approached people’s changes in moral orientation over time from the perspective that people can progress to what may be viewed as advanced or higher moral development. Finally, Rest et al. (1999, 2000) also characterize development as a shift from conventional to post-conventional moral thinking. Like, Kohlberg, Rest et al., (2000) believe the development from conventional to post-conventional to be sequential as opposed to Turiel’s (1983) categorization of the two areas into separate domains.

However, Rest et al.’s (2000) approach also differed from Kohlberg’s theory in several ways. One philosophical difference was that Kohlberg emphasized universality across all cultures as a characteristic of his stages (Kohlberg & Gilligan, 1971). However, Rest et al. (2000) advocate for the viewpoint that morality is a social construct which stems from a community’s shared experiences, which when combined with communication and trends within the community or culture, gain popularity and support within that community or culture. In short, Kohlberg believed in a common morality, consistent throughout all cultures and communities, while Rest et al. (1999, 2000) emphasize the role of individual cultures or communities in determining moral righteousness.

**Stages vs. schemas.** Rest et al. rely upon schemas instead of Kohlberg’s use of hard stages. Where Kohlberg uses definitive stages to map hierarchical progression, Rest et al., view the progression as shifted distributions. Rest et al. view progression through schemas as an increased frequency of advanced moral decision making processes.

One significant developmental advance during adolescence is the child’s realization that people in society interact with each other through systems and established social practices (Kohlberg, 1984; Rest et al., 2000; Youniss & Yates, 1997). The lowest schema, the Personal
Interest schema, contains Kohlberg’s second and third stages. This schema is prior to a person achieving the thought process in which he or she considers problems from a macro-moral perspective, that is, someone who takes into account larger societal network implications. Decisions of people in the Personal Interest schema are based off consequences for the decision maker as well as others who might be close to the decision maker.

The next schema, the Maintaining Norms schema, derives from Kohlberg’s stage four (Rest et al., 2000). People in the Maintaining Norms schema may be considered to be approaching morality from a more developed standpoint because they are now approaching moral problems from more of a macro-moral perspective. That is, decision makers are now beginning to consider others in society beyond the decision maker’s web of close friends and family. Individuals in this schema also begin identifying established practices and societal rules, which is the initial stage of society-wide cooperation (Rest et al., 2000). People in this schema acknowledge the need for structure, rules, and authority figures. Individuals at this level obey authorities not because of respect for the individual authority figure, but out of respect for the balance provided by the social system. Adhering to social order thus defines morality for people in the Maintaining Norms schema. In contrast, people in the highest schema, the Postconventional schema, define morals through ideals and logic (Rest et al., 2000).

Kohlberg’s stages five and six make up the Postconventional schema. Postconventional thinking is based off a morality emphasizing shared ideals, which are subject to debate and tests of logic. Rest et al.’s Postconventional schema does not favor any one model of moral philosophy. Additionally, the Postconventional schema is composed of a few elements: (1) primacy of moral criteria, (2) emphasis on shareable ideals, (3) and reciprocity (Rest et al., 1999).
Moral Judgment Interviews vs. the Defining Issues Test. Kohlberg’s research relied upon a Moral Judgment Interview (MJI), which was a process involving questioning of individuals on hypothetical moral scenarios. The interviews were intended to ascertain how individuals explained moral decisions related to the hypothetical scenarios. The intention was to evaluate the decision making process rather than the subjects’ eventual conclusions. After numerous adjustments, Kohlberg’s MJI developed into a joint scoring system by Colby and Kohlberg (Colby et al., 1987), which was intended to test reasoning related to moral dilemmas. Kohlberg’s research and the MJI presumed that interviewees were able to articulate moral judgments in an error free manner (Kohlberg, 1976; Narvaez & Bock, 2002). Interviewees’ responses were sanitized of content and underlying cognitive structures were identified and scored. The moral reasoning used is considered to be structure, while the primary answer or conclusion represents the content, which must be separated (Reimer et al., 1983).

Kohlberg’s approach and research has faced critiques regarding the philosophical viewpoint of Kohlberg’s theory as well as his research methodology. Simpson (1974) claimed that Kohlberg’s model was based on Western philosophical viewpoints, and attempted to apply it to other cultures. Another significant criticism to Kohlberg’s research was the male-centric nature of his interviews and his interview sample. Indeed, Kohlberg’s theory was developed using male sample groups, which according to Gilligan (1982), makes his theory inappropriate for females. Gilligan posited that males are more concerned with rules and rights while females are more concerned with interpersonal relationships and compassion. Lyons (1983) added that males are more concerned with view of morality that is based on rationality, while females view morality through a relationship-centric view. Gilligan’s (1982) research found that women who were interviewed for Kohlberg’s stages hovered around stage three, which has been attributed to
a more feminine perspective and female relationship-based terminology being interpreted to fall into stage three due to an interview grading system that was designed around the male perspective, using male terminology. The DIT would eventually put many of the aforementioned criticisms to rest due to its lack of reliance upon articulation and terminology.

Rest (1973) set out to create a research tool, the DIT, which was originally intended partially as an alternative to the cumbersome MJI process. The DIT uses a Likert scale to quantitatively rank responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas. Researchers have evaluated the DIT’s ability measure moral judgment (Rest et al., 1999), and some have even found the DIT to provide a perhaps more precise measurement than the MJI regarding moral judgments at Kohlberg’s stages five and six, or the Postconventional schema (Narvaez & Bock, 2002). Rest et al. (1999, 2000) relies upon subjects’ recognition knowledge by presenting them with words on a page, which is credited with the DIT’s success in evaluating moral judgment at the higher stages (Narvaez & Bock, 2002). However, the MJI required subjects to logically and coherently verbally articulate their perspectives.

The neo-Kohlbergian approach refuses to rely solely upon evaluation of people’s explanations of their moral judgments. Rest et al. (2000) agree with Nisbett and Wilson (1977), and Uleman and Bargh (1989) who argued that a person’s descriptions of his or her own inner processes’ underlying moral decisions have significant limitations. Rest et al. (1999, 2000) veered from Kohlberg’s model by asserting that Kohlberg constrained interviewees by only giving them credit for cognitive processes that they could verbally defend in interviews. Indeed, inability to explain a stimulus or process does not necessarily mean that a person does not understand that stimulus or process.
Another difference found in the neo-Kohlbergian approach is that Rest et al. (2000) do not claim to assess cognitive operations as was the case with Kohlberg’s most recent version of the MJI (Colby, Kohlberg, & Speicher, 1987). Instead, Rest et al.’s DIT measures stage shifts predominantly at stages five and six of Kohlberg’s hierarchy (Narvaez & Bock, 2002).

The neo-Kohlbergian approach is based off the belief that people’s perceptions of what is morally right change over time, as people adjust to their environment. The neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s theory was also based off the assumption that instructors are uniquely positioned to create those environments for students through hypothetical moral dilemmas in the classroom. Using social interaction such as discussions and cognitive conflict such as hypothetical moral dilemmas, instructors can help students expand their levels of moral reasoning (Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975). Kohlberg’s stages and Rest et al.’s schemas were ways of mapping a person’s relative position within a type of continuum of morality. Depending upon a particular student’s moral stage, instructors can use increasingly advanced hypothetical moral dilemmas in the classroom to create further cognitive conflict and promote advancement to the next level or schema of moral development (Blatt & Kohlberg, 1975).

The neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development is the foundation for several assumptions related to this study. Kohlberg’s assertion that educators can advance moral thinking in students (Kohlberg, 1969) provides a foundation for the assumption that students’ moral knowledge can be increased through classroom instruction and activities. Additionally, the neo-Kohlbergian approach provides justification for the presumption that older students, such as those at the graduate level can enhance their moral knowledge through classroom exercises since moral development seems to be less dependent upon age than it is upon social awareness (Rest et al., 1999).
Conclusion

The common good approach to CSR theory provides the foundation for this study’s assumption that ethics are important to businesses, organizations, and their managers. Thus, security managers, as managers within businesses and organizations, should have ethical knowledge as part of their roles in those businesses and organizations. The neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development refines the study’s assumption that students, specifically security management students’ moral development can be fostered through various classroom activities such as cognitive conflict and social interaction.

The initial organization of this paper, along with thoughtful consideration of each section herein, have aided in refining the research topic and provided structure and direction for continued research. This research is intended to shed light on ethics in security education, which is an area of research that has received little, if any attention among security or education researchers although the topic is relevant to security educators, business managers, security professional bodies, and security managers. This research also increases the depth of the current organizational security body of work, since the results are likely be generalizable to the entire population of graduate level security programs in the U.S.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This literature review addresses the case for the inclusion of ethics in graduate organizational Security Management programs in the United States. The main themes that emerged from the literature relate to the importance of ethics in higher education, the role of ethics and education in security management as a practice and as a profession, and security management’s evolution toward a business and management field of study.

The literature established the clear importance of ethics studies in higher education and that instructors’ have the ability to effectively teach ethics. The findings also provide a foundation for discussion on the importance of ethics in promoting security management’s progress toward professional status as well as the importance of ethics and ethics studies to the practice of security management. The literature also addresses the study of security management as a body of work and establishes security’s evolution toward a business and management centric area of study. Based off that connection to business and management, research into ethics studies within business and management schools can be examined as a backdrop for an initial exploration of ethics studies in organizational Security Management programs. Additionally, literature on ethics studies within business and management programs provides a level of comparison for the study. Finally, CSR theory and the Neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s Theory of Moral Development can be applied to round out the discussion on ethics in security management practice and education.

Ethics in Higher Education

Opponents of ethics instruction such as Hartman (2006) and Ritter (2006) might argue that students’ ethics are already formed upon entrance into higher education or that simply exposing students to ethics studies will not promote ethical action when students are faced with
real-world management situations. However, Kohlberg and Turiel’s (1971) research found that teaching ethics can improve moral judgment. Koehn (2005) also found that graduate education can effectively expose students to the legal, ethical, and social implications of their decisions. Other research supports Kohlberg’s premise that ethics taught to college students can improve their moral reasoning, ethical awareness, and ethical behavior (Mayhew & Murphy, 2009; VanSandt, 2005). Earley and Kelly (2004) conducted pre and post tests on students at the beginning and end of a semester. The tests showed that students’ moral reasoning for ethical dilemmas increased. Additionally, Fraedrich, Cherry, King, and Guo (2005) found that ethics education positively affected students’ cognitive moral development. Indeed, all higher education programs should incorporate ethics studies in order to produce graduates with ethical awareness and action (Fraederick & Guerts, 1990).

One would be misguided to think that exposing students to ethics education will cause them to act morally (Hartman, 2006; Izzo, Langford, & Vitell, 2006). However, instructors, regardless of the subject, should expose students to knowledge of ethics out of the simple desire to arm students with the knowledge to become ethical leaders and practitioners (Farnsworth & Kleiner, 2003). Another argument for the inclusion of ethics within all education programs is the inherent implication created by a lack of ethics education. One might argue that educators who fail to incorporate ethics are implying that ethics are not important to the study at hand. It follows that, if ethics are not important to the study at hand, they must also be of no importance to the practice to follow. Thus, one might conclude that instructors who do not include ethics studies are sending the message that ethics are not important in life or in a particular practice.

Other opponents of ethics in higher education might say that ethics studies do not relate to the real world, and that even if students are taught about ethics, they will not necessarily act
ethically when faced with ethical situations. The flaws of such arguments are exposed by simply applying the logic to all studies. Educators can never ensure that students will act in a way commensurate with their teachings once faced with a situation. Simply teaching a student about environmental science does not ensure that the student will remember or later act on the information when they later work as an environmental scientist. Should we then not bother teaching environmental science to future environmental scientists?

Additionally, instructors are likely teaching students about morals, even if unintentionally. Kohlberg (1980) referred to a hidden curriculum, in which students learn about life through everyday interactions, rules, and socialization on campus. Application of the hidden curriculum to Kohlberg’s theory has students learning to base moral righteousness partially upon what pleases or displeases the instructor. One can see remnants of this simply by thinking back to high-school and remembering that students who failed to follow instructions or spoke out in class, were referred to as the bad kids or trouble makers. Indeed, students were influenced to make a moral decision regarding the type of people that other students were simply because of the reinforcement from instructors that failure to abide by authority makes someone a bad kid. One might argue that this type of hidden curriculum also reinforced the importance of pleasing the instructor, or authority figure, as the primary determinant of a moral or immoral action. This type of moral reasoning falls directly into Kohlberg’s fourth stage or Rest’s Maintaining Norms schema.

Application of the hidden curriculum concept shows that every anecdote, class exercise, and interaction affects students’ perceptions of ethical behavior. Failure to recognize this fact may cause instructors to unconsciously conduct moral mis-education (Kohlberg, 1980) much like the aforementioned scenario. Although the aforementioned scenario involved younger students,
Rest et al. (1999) found that moral development is less dependent upon age than it is upon social awareness. Thus, one can apply the hidden curriculum concept to undergraduate and graduate students. This is especially important within organizational Security Management programs, which attract military veterans, law enforcement, and public safety personnel who are arguably more drawn to a vertical, chain of command style of environment in which the instructor, often also a veteran or prior law enforcement, is respected as an authority figure. One can imagine the ease with which one of these instructors can unintentionally sway the moral decision making of a budding security manager by simply implying that morally questionable actions are justified.

One might also argue that security management students, who are likely predisposed to reasoning at stage four or Maintaining Norms schema (Rest et al., 1999) due to emphasis on authority, are more in need of moral education in order to progress their reasoning beyond simple reliance on regulations, laws, policy, and authority as moral decisions.

Another often cited goal of ethics and education in a particular field is to elevate the field toward professional status (Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Simonsen, 1996; Rogers, 2000). Professionals also seek to set themselves apart from other fields by building society’s trust through education to build credibility, long-term ethical decision making by members of the profession, and ethical standards associated with the profession (Friedson, 1994). Education and ethical standards are thus considerably linked to professional status.

**Professional Status and Security Management**

Although contemporary use of the term “professional” among popular culture has also promoted the use of the term “profession” to describe any trade or job, researchers in numerous fields have conducted research regarding professionalism in specific fields. Some researchers have attempted to identify specific traits that are mandatory in identifying a profession.
Four criteria are mandatory to qualify management as a profession (Khurana, Nohria, & Penrice, 2005). A common body of knowledge based on a well-developed and widely accepted theoretical base is the first characteristic required of a profession. In addition, a certification system must exist before a person can practice or attain licensure within the profession. Professionals must also commit to use their specialized knowledge for the public good and renounce the goal of personal profit maximization. The aforementioned commitment occurs in exchange for professional autonomy and monopoly of power (Khurana et al., 2005). Additionally, a code of ethics must exist along with provisions for monitoring compliance with the code and a system of sanctions for enforcing it (Khurana et al., 2005). Other researchers agree that a professional code of ethics is mandatory for qualification as a profession (Black & Hertig, 2008; Simonsen, 1996).

Simonsen (1996) listed several criteria for a profession: specific standards, a code of ethics, a body of knowledge and professional journals, professional certifications, and an educational discipline that prepares students for the practice and theory of the trade. Other security researchers have also researched professionalism.

Black and Hertig (2008) described seven characteristics necessary in a profession. Professions must have a recognized body of knowledge and the workers within a profession must acquire advanced education and training. Professions must also require an experiential component or apprenticeship (Black & Hertig, 2008). Black and Hertig (2008) also stated that professionals must be held to a code of ethics and be members of a professional organization or association. Professions must also have a degree of exclusivity, which prevents anyone from being a member of the profession. Finally, the public must readily recognize a profession as such. The aforementioned researchers agreed upon several characteristics defining a profession:
a recognized body of knowledge, existence of a professional organization, a certification system, a code of ethics, and public recognition that the job qualifies as a profession.

Although security management may not be considered to be a profession by many, some security scholars such as Becker (1991) and Fischer et al. (2008) believe the expansion of education in the field, and the increase in research enhancing the security management body of work provide evidence of the trend toward professionalization in security. In its progress toward widespread acceptance as a profession, security management has a responsibility to critically assess its effects on mankind and to investigate manners in which it may contribute to society. If security is to be a profession, it must expose its students to questions regarding the role of security management and general management in society. A profession must provide future professionals with the skills to critically assess what it means to act responsibly as a member of a profession (Friedson, 1994) and assist organizations in emphasizing CSR.

Borodzicz and Gibson (2006) also referenced the security professional bodies’ emphasis on the existence of codes of ethics as one of several primary tenants pushing security toward professionalism. The ASIS International adopted a code of ethics, which emphasizes obeying the law, truthfulness, faithfulness and diligence, competence, and safeguarding privileged information (ASIS International, 2011). The IFPO, which is a prominent professional organization for security officers, describes the establishment of a professional ethics standard for security officers as a primary objective of the organization (IFPO, 1996). Additionally, in 2008 the Interim Security Professionals’ Taskforce determined five required characteristics for security to be considered a profession (Griffiths, Brooks, & Corkill, 2010; Interim Security Professionals’ Taskforce, 2008). Characteristics included agreed upon and enforced ethical and behavioral standards, educational standards, formal professional development, a college of peers,
and a distinct body of knowledge (Griffiths et al., 2010; Interim Security Professionals' Taskforce, 2008, p. 10).

Pepper (2003), however, argued that a code of ethics implies that a governing body will control the actions of members within the profession, and that security has no such governing body. Thus, security managers must self-regulate. However, a profession’s ability to self-regulate may be ineffective without the understanding and application of the profession’s ethical standards by individual professionals during the practice. Thus, graduate organizational Security Management programs must include ethics education to foster awareness of ethical dilemmas salient to security managers and to provide methods of analysis and resolution.

Lack of education on potential ethical dilemmas may result in instances of poor or unethical decisions by security managers and security executives. Those poor or unethical decisions may cause security managers to experience the same widespread distrust from the general public that many of their business management counterparts experienced after the numerous ethical breaches of executives in recent years. Such distrust would significantly hinder security management from a professional standpoint.

Widespread distrust would surely stagger security’s recent attempts to gain professional status, especially given the consistent inclusion of ethics as a core requirement for an occupation hoping to make the leap to classification as profession (Borodzicz & Gibson, 2006; Black & Hertig, 2008; Khurana et al., 2005; Simonsen, 1996). Additionally, the numerous security professional bodies such as ASIS International, the IFPO, and the Security Institute would want members purporting to be security professionals to be prepared and knowledgeable enough to abide by their required professional codes of ethics. Additionally, any other proponents of improving security management’s status as a profession such as Australia’s Interim Security
Professional’s Task Force, might find use in the knowledge that ethics, a key component defining a profession, is or is not generally being covered in the graduate programs intended to prepare future security managers.

Like many other positions, security managers seek professional credibility and status through recognized security certifications such as the Board Certification in Security Management (CPP). The CPP certification includes ethics questions as part of the certification testing requirement (ASIS International, 2011a). Thus, practicing security managers hoping to attain professional board certification have an interest in how well organizational Security Management programs prepare them for the ethics component of the security management professional certification.

**Organizational Security and Security Managers**

Fischer and Green (2004) reported that organizational security personnel seek to provide protection against hazards. Typically, security practitioners categorize hazards in one of two ways: manmade or natural. Manmade hazards include crimes against persons or property including espionage, civil disturbances, bomb threats, terrorism, and assault. Natural hazards include fires, windstorms, floods, and other acts of nature. A hazard must exist before management organizes an effort to prevent or minimize that hazard.

According to McCrie (2001), many aspects of security services delivery have changed in recent years and security has experienced steady growth since the end of World War II. McCrie attributed this steady growth to business requirements. An organization’s defined needs predicate asset allocations. Thus, security managers justify security spending through evidence of security programs effectively mitigating risk and saving money. Americans’ focus on security in the years following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks also aid security managers and
consultants in justifying security funding within organizations. However, the recent economic downturn has affected organizational security as much, if not more than other departments, since organizational security is often not considered a profit center (Fischer & Green, 2004).

Security personnel are typically either categorized as proprietary or contract (Fay, 2006; Fischer & Green, 2004). Proprietary security personnel are hired, equipped, and trained by the organization to be secured. Proprietary security personnel typically enjoy better benefits and pay than contract security personnel. Some researchers argue that proprietary security systems attract better-qualified and more highly motivated security officers due to better benefits and higher compensation (Fischer & Green, 2004). Additionally, proponents of proprietary security believe that proprietary security officers show higher levels of loyalty to the protected organization than contract security personnel show. Contracted security personnel are often less expensive than proprietary security. Additionally, contract security forces are typically more flexible regarding staffing changes and requirements. Use of contract security forces greatly reduces the protected organization’s necessary administrative tasks since the contracted security firm conducts security related administrative tasks.

Researchers have also discussed a recent trend toward hybrid security systems (Fay, 2006; Fischer & Green, 2004). Hybrid security systems involve the use of contract security officers for some security tasks while proprietary security personnel conduct the remaining security tasks. Hybrid security systems often require an engaged corporate liaison representing the organization to the security firm, contract management support, periodic reviews of the contract and performance, and accurate quality measurements. One trend is that organizations are contracting security officers while hiring proprietary security managers to oversee the contract security personnel and manage other aspects of the organization’s security. This trend
toward hybrid security systems places even more ethical responsibility upon security managers, since they must now attempt to emphasize CSR by accounting for and overseeing the actions of security officers whose loyalties are possibly split between the contract security company and the organization.

**Security management.** McCrie (2001, p. 5) defined a security manager as “a person who protects identified assets through personnel, procedures, and systems under his or her control.” The security manager’s goal is to meet agreed upon security objectives. Additionally, senior management expects security managers to reach objectives with minimal encumbrances to organizational goals. Ortmeier (2005) added that security managers establish policies and procedures for disaster recovery, emergency management, fire prevention, security education, loss prevention, and asset protection.

Security managers’ responsibilities are managerial, administrative, preventive, and investigative in nature (Fay, 2006; Nalla, 1996; Ortmeier, 2005). Managerial duties of contemporary security managers include selection, scheduling, evaluation, and training of security personnel. Issues related to morale, productivity, compensation, well-being, and professional growth of security personnel are also security management responsibilities (Ortmeier, 2005).

As an administrator, the contemporary security executive establishes security’s organizational vision, mission, goals, and objectives (ASIS International, 2008). Security administration includes creation of a vision for the security operation and administration of daily security department operations. Planning, financial control, public relations, and community liaisons are also significant security administrative tasks.
Security managers serve as preventative officers by managing risk through anticipation, analysis, and protection of an organization from hazards and threats (Ortmeier, 2005). Security managers are accountable for prevention of loss from any source and they recognize hazards, appraise hazards, and initiate action to reduce risk of loss (Ray & Hertig, 2008). Paradoxically, security managers who are successful in their preventative role have added difficulty in proving their own effectiveness. Proper preventative measures may lead to a “hard target” perception of the organization and minimize security incidents. Few security incidents might lead to senior managers’ perceptions that security is unnecessary since few incidents occur.

When organizational losses occur, security managers fill the role of reactionary investigators. Security managers investigate and determine causes of losses. Pro-active investigative measures include conducting background investigations on prospective employees and site audits to ensure properly functioning security measures (Pastor, 2007).

The job of a security manager differs in many ways from other forms of management. Security managers create, implement, and maintain various controls over personal behavior. Other managers market, sell, finance, move, or administrate a product or service (McCrie, 2001; Purpura, 2002). Although security management relates to the aforementioned standard management tasks, security managers manipulate behavior to reduce or eliminate loss across all organizational departments. Additionally, security managers face a distinct challenge, which many other types of managers are not required to face. Security managers must often justify the existence of security expenditures often without showing tangible results. One can only imagine how often security managers rely upon their moral development in making a CSR related argument to justify such expenditures. Ethics arguably provide the foundation for security management, either through ethical management decisions fostering organizational CSR goals or
through moral reasoning as a foundation for security decisions made to protect an organization and the surrounding community.

**Ethics in security management.** The importance of ethics in security management extends from the daily practice of security managers to the foundation of security management as a profession. Ethics relate to action or lack of action, which may be considered morally questionable, and yet fall short of breaching criminal or civil laws (McCrie, 2001). Within many organizations, security personnel are arbiters, and are often considered part of the organization’s ethical resources by conducting corporate ethics training, and investigating accusations of unethical behavior (McCrie, 2001). Thus, security and security management personnel have further motivation to act ethically, and prepare themselves for ethical decisions in the workplace.

Some of the most prominent security professional bodies have created profiles detailing the key requirements of contemporary security managers and security executives, and the profiles emphasize ethics. ASIS International also created a Chief Security Officer (CSO) Guideline (ASIS International, 2008), which includes a model profile of the security executive function. The CSO Guideline lists ethics and reputation as a key consideration, which requires security executives to have leadership skills (ASIS International, 2008). The CSO Guideline (ASIS International, 2008) also lists some of the key security executive competencies as emotional maturity and ethical decision making in order to handle ethical and crisis situations as well as supervise the investigation of ethical issues within the organization. Additionally, the Security Executive Council, made up of security subject matter experts, also created a security leadership matrix, which diagrams the primary knowledge elements necessary of a security executive. The matrix includes six key elements, and numerous sub-elements. The matrix also lists business conduct and ethics as a sub-element within the business-related key element.
Ethics studies may be arguably more important to security managers than to other managers given security managers’ duties not only as managers, but as investigators of ethics violations, protectors of employees, and coordinators of crisis responses (McCrie, 2001; Tombs & Smith, 1995). Organizations give security managers and security personnel enhanced authority allowing them to complete workplace searches, investigations, document analysis, and possibly use force to protect people or assets in the name of the organization.

Enhanced authority begets increased responsibility. Increased access to private information disclosed as part of a search or investigation should also rightly require heightened levels of ethical knowledge and awareness to minimize ethical breaches or basic violations of rights. Additionally, unlike many other managers, failure by security managers to understand ethics and act ethically could result in security breaches or failed crises responses that not only result in hindered reputation for the organization and loss of revenue, but most importantly, physical harm to employees.

The aforementioned distrust caused by unethical management decisions, which would hinder the professional progress of security, would also hinder security management from a practical standpoint. Distrust for security managers would significantly hinder work performance as well. How can security personnel effectively perform their duties if executives and employees do not trust them to handle their enhanced authority and access to information in the workplace? Failure to include ethics education into security management curricula would also likely result in many instances in which security managers are forced to rely solely upon ethics training provided by the same corporations that have allowed the past highly publicized ethical infractions.
Security Management as a Body of Work and a Field of Study

One reason for the apparent lack of focus on ethics in security studies may be a reflection of security’s youth and tumultuousness as a field of study. Security is still a concept in search of a definition because contemporary security services are so complex and fluid that they defy definition (Griffiths et al., 2010; Interim Security Professionals' Taskforce, 2008). Brooks (2010) mentioned that the security industry’s multidisciplinary nature (Hesse & Smith, 2001) and heterogeneous occupations have added to difficulties in defining the term security (Tate, 1997).

Ortmeier (2005) discussed a foundation for security that is based on a few behavioral assumptions. First, individuals typically prefer pleasure instead of pain and often make inappropriate decisions in search of gratification. Second, people commit crimes when suitable targets of opportunity exist and social control is lacking. Third, crime will always exist, but people can reduce the opportunity for crime through environmental manipulation. Fourth, in addition to criminal behavior, other human activities and natural occurrences create hazards, which may occur if people do not implement appropriate prevention and mitigation strategies.

Contemporary security scholars have given the term “security” various definitions. Fischer and Green (2004, p. 21) described security as a “stable, relatively predictable environment in which an individual or group may pursue its ends without disruption or harm and without fear of disturbance or injury.” Purpura (2002) described security as the use of traditional methods to control crime and provide a tranquil environment for an individual or organization to pursue objectives. McCrie (2001, p. 5) described security as “the protection of assets from loss.” Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2008) defined security as “freedom from danger.” Kennedy (1995) defined security as efforts by individuals or groups to protect their assets from
loss, harm, or reduction in value. All of the aforementioned definitions of security focus on protection of a person or asset. Security personnel seek to prevent unwanted behaviors, thus one might consider security measures to be pro-active endeavors.

**Security management education.** Regardless of the specific title of security education programs, they have been a focus of security’s most prominent professional body: ASIS International. The ASIS Academic/Practitioner Symposium, which is arguably the foremost body dedicated to developing security education, is described as an international forum for promoting ongoing communication and dialogue between security academicians and security practitioners (ASIS International, 2008a). The Symposiums have met yearly since 1997 in an effort to combine experience and expertise of the security educators and practitioners to gain a consensus regarding security education, “to discuss and debate issues and trends in the field, and to take actions that can result in the development of educational programs at the baccalaureate and graduate levels that respond to those cutting-edge issues” (ASIS International, 2008a, p. 1). The ASIS Academic/Practitioner Symposium proceedings refer to “security management programs” and “security education programs” interchangeably when describing security programs intended for corporate, organizational, campus, or industrial security practitioners (ASIS International, 2008a).

The ASIS Academic/Practitioner Symposium (2009) has established that organizational security management education is a discrete field of academic study, separate from criminal justice. As such, organizational Security Management programs should ideally be situated within the college or school of business administration, rather than in the criminal justice department. Additionally, those organizational Security Management programs that are not
aligned within business schools should be, at a minimum, interdisciplinary and incorporate management and business theory and concepts.

Security practitioners and researchers have taken steps to identify specialties within contemporary security. Security personnel and researchers identified 18 security functions that frame the security industry during the 2001 ASIS International Academic/Practitioner Symposium (ASIS, 2001). The 18 security functions listed were physical security, personnel security, information systems security, investigations, loss prevention, risk management, legal aspects, emergency/continuity planning, fire protection, crisis management, disaster management, counterterrorism, competitive intelligence, executive protection, workplace violence, general crime prevention, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), and security architecture. However, other researchers proposed what seems to be a conflicting view of only four knowledge categories for security education: business and management, security, computing and IT and a generic category including research and analytics (Hesse & Smith, 2001).

Post and Kingsbury (1977) laid the foundation for a definition of security management by describing three subsystems within security management curriculums: Physical security, personnel security, and information security. Currently, researchers typically define organizational Security Management programs using, at a minimum, the study of the areas of physical security, personnel security, information or information systems security, and general security management (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2010; Kennedy, 1984). Additional security subject areas such as executive protection, general business, risk management, security investigations, counterterrorism, and business continuity are often
included as security management subject areas (Heskett, 1993). Organizational Security Management programs are focused on security from an organizational context.

ASIS International (2008a; p. 6) also described several suggested core competencies and recommended that graduates of graduate level organizational Security Management programs be able to demonstrate the following:

- Manage people in any organizational setting (for example, defining job requirements, hiring, evaluating, and motivating).
- Influence others in normal and crisis conditions
- Communicate effectively (orally, in writing, through liaison, and at all levels of the organization, including the executive level)
- Conduct research and analysis—formal and informal—quickly, accurately, and creatively
- Understanding of legal, regulatory, and policy issues
- Understanding of risk management and risk analysis (including such risks as terrorism, internal threats, financial threats, white-collar crimes, business continuity issues, and crisis management)
- Conduct and manage investigations (including investigations of white-collar crimes and ethical violations)
- Understanding of the role of security and asset protection in an organizational setting
- Understanding of the systems approach to security (including how different functions work together and how to address security-related issues creatively)
- Manage very large and complex issues or projects
- Justify security programs financially and demonstrate the value they add to the organizational mission
• Operate within different types of organizational structures

The ASIS International Academic/Practitioner Symposium also made an important distinction between security management, homeland security, and international security as areas of study for educational programs. Although international security and homeland security may be covered within a security management curriculum, they are specialized enough to warrant classification as separate areas of study and even separate degrees. Indeed, the ASIS International Academic/Practitioner Symposium met partially in an effort to determine the extent of international security as a field of study in 2007, and again in 2009 to determine the extent of homeland security as a field of study. Symposium members determined that international affairs, international business, and international security measures should be the primary general focus areas of international security education programs (ASIS International, 2008a).

The symposium later determined that homeland security curricula should be characterized by broad security studies aimed at protecting the national infrastructure including courses such as terrorism, infrastructure protection, emergency preparedness, homeland security, and global intelligence studies (ASIS International, 2010). One can see the clear distinction between the broader national or international security issues observed within international security and homeland security educational programs as opposed to the business and organizational focus of security management programs. This same distinction can be applied to the ethics studies provided within the programs. Organizational Security Management programs should likely rely at least partially upon CSR concepts and management ethics as key aspects of their ethics studies, given their organizational context. However, homeland security or international security programs have a macro focus, and might thus focus less on ethics from an organizational or management context.
ASIS International (ASIS International, 2006) has also made progress toward a program-specific accreditation body for security programs. The proposed accreditation includes requirements related to concerns including instructor qualifications, curriculum content, available resources, recertification requirements, capstone requirements, and governance. The accreditation would also require that graduates be capable of assessing security risks in complex organizations; conceptualize and articulating sound, cost-effective security strategies; understand security methods and technologies at an advanced level; understand security’s role in organizations; and understand the values and ethics of a security management professional. Indeed, if the proposed accrediting body comes to fruition, organizational Security Management program administrators may need to include ethics studies if only to earn accreditation, and meet industry standards to remain competitive.

Additionally, the study of security is still in its infancy. From a research standpoint, if security education does not incorporate ethics now, security researchers might later find themselves scrambling to justify the need for ethics in security management studies against opponents who question the sudden necessity for a focus on ethics. That, however, is a best-case scenario. A more concerning scenario would be an implied justification for ethics studies during the wake of a highly publicized ethical scandal associated with one or more security managers. Indeed, this was the occasion for business managers and CEOs after corporate scandals made national headlines. Perhaps one positive that may arise from the recent wave of corporate scandals in the U.S. could be the lessons learned by other managers and their educators. Security managers have an opportunity to help avert a potential similar ethical crisis in the security industry, but it all starts with ethics studies in security management education.
Security management education and business education. Security education has logically evolved from placement within criminal justice fields to an increasingly management focused study (Nalla, Christian, Morash, & Schram, 1995). While the security field is rapidly becoming more specialized and distant from criminal justice, it is simultaneously becoming more similar to business. Although many would still immediately categorize security as a study within criminal justice, many researchers believe security management to be now more appropriately aligned with business and management (ASIS International, 2008a). Indeed, Bordzicz and Gibson (2006) and ASIS International (2009) described security as a management function more so than a criminal justice function. Additionally, corporate security is often a significant factor affecting a corporation’s profitability and share price (Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006).

Security management is currently a multi-disciplinary field including areas such as law, business, management, disaster preparedness, physical security, human resources, and contingency planning (Brooks, 2010). Although researchers can easily categorize security into a form of public safety, the goal of organizational security is typically business or organizational success (Ferriera, 2007). Security is meant to minimize shrink, thereby increasing profits and to protect workers, minimizing liability and maximizing work time spent actually working. The aforementioned goals of security differ significantly from public safety and maintenance of public order, which are the goals of public law enforcement. Although specialized in nature, security management is simply a function within businesses and organizations, and as such, can arguably be consolidated with business and management regarding ethical studies as well.

According to the ASIS International (2001), future security managers should have a business education as well as emergency management, security, and business management skill sets. Holladay’s (2003) research revealed that security managers must have at least some
background and education in business matters, while Nalla’s (1996) research revealed an emphasis on business and communication skills within security management graduate curricula. Heskett (1993) argued that security managers need to know as much about planning, organizing, and staffing as they do about security, and that a strong management focus must be emphasized in organizational Security Management curriculums. Davidson (2005) also mentioned that security management has evolved into a free-standing management science requiring recognition as an independent academic discipline. Finally, Becker (1991) argued that security managers should be business management first and security experts second. Thus, one can see that security management studies, although often grouped with criminal justice, are perhaps best aligned with business and management studies. It follows that ethics studies in organizational Security Management might parallel ethics studies in business and management programs.

Ethics Studies in Business Education

Christensen, Peirce, Hartman, Hoffman, and Carrier, (2007) described business ethics as a form of applied ethics, which examines moral rules within the business context, various ethical problems that can arise in a business setting, and special duties applying to people who are engaged in commerce. Christensen et al. (2007) also described an organization’s CSR as voluntary actions taken by companies to address economic, social and environmental impacts of its business operations.

Many authors would argue that business schools have an obligation to address ethics education in their respective programs (AACSB, 2010; ACBSP, 1992; Swanson & Fisher, 2008). Ketchum (2010) emphasized the centrality of ethical responsibility at both the individual and corporate levels when MBA programs prepare business leaders. Ketchum further stated that business schools should encourage students to develop a deep understanding of the myriad
challenges surrounding corporate responsibility and corporate governance; provide students with tools for recognizing and responding to ethical issues, and engage students at an individual level through analyses of both positive and negative examples of everyday conduct in business. Building an ethical awareness, ethical reasoning skills, and core ethical principles in students helps guide future business leaders as they respond to a changing legal environment with complex, conflicting, and sometimes highly problematic interests and opportunities (Ketchum, 2010).

Administrators and instructors of business or management programs should include ethics for accreditation and professional reasons as well. The two primary accrediting bodies for business and management programs, The American Assembly of Collegiate Business Schools (AACSB) and the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), both emphasize the importance of ethics within business and management programs by listing ethics as requirements for accreditation (AACSB 2010; ACBSP, 1992; Sikula, 1996). Additionally, the main academic association to which management instructors belong, The Academy of Management, within its code of ethical conduct, tells management instructors to include ethics in their instruction (Academy of Management, 2011; Sikula, 1996). Thus, security management program administrators hoping to add credibility to their programs as legitimate management programs should include ethics studies.

Managers within businesses and organizations should have ethical knowledge as part of their roles in those businesses and organizations (AACSB, 2010; ACBSP, 1992; Swanson & Fisher, 2008). Thus, researchers have developed a significant amount of research into ethics studies within business programs, and that research has fallen into three distinct categories: (1) The prominence and need for ethics studies in business programs, (2) The effect of ethics
Kohlberg laid a foundation, which Rest refined in order to foster the presumption that students can experience moral development and awareness through classroom activities and instruction. Thus, much of the following research into business ethics education is built either explicitly or implicitly off the frameworks created by Kohlberg and Rest since they explore the instruction of ethics or CSR to business and management students.

Prominence and need for ethics education within business programs. Christensen et al. (2007) provided a recent snapshot of the current status of ethics in top business programs by surveying MBA Program administrators from the Financial Times Top 50 Business Schools to determine the prominence and placement of ethics studies or Corporate Social Responsibility studies within their programs. The results established a current baseline for the prominence of ethics within Top 50 MBA programs. Christensen et al. found that a majority of the business schools require that ethics be covered in their MBA curriculum and many schools are following Kohlberg’s example by teaching these topics using experiential learning and immersion techniques. Finally, Christensen et al. noted a 500% increase in the number of stand-alone ethics courses since Paine’s (1988) comparable study on the prominence of ethics studies in American business schools.

The researchers examined the placement and teaching methods for ethics studies in top 50 MBA programs to further progress toward gaining an understanding of the most effective way to teach ethics in business programs. Christensen et al. (2007) also used the term CSR interchangeably with business ethics. Although Christensen et al. mentioned the resistance to ethics in business education, the researchers also based their research off the presumption that
business ethics should be required in MBA programs. Approximately 15 years earlier, the need for ethics studies in business programs was not so clearly established.

More than a decade before Christensen et al.’s (2007) research, Sims and Sims (1991) explored the background behind what was, at the time, a recent emphasis on ethics within business programs. Sims and Sims described a reactive approach to ethics education as well as poor training of ethics instructors in business curriculums as problems. Sims and Sims focused on societal issues which lead to a problem within corporate America: the decline of ethics in business. Sims and Sims further provided data on a shortage of ethics in business curriculums and the percentages of programs offering stand-alone ethics courses vs. integrated studies.

Ghorpade (1991) covered previous studies on the teaching of ethics in business programs in the U.S. Ghorpade used examples of the need for business ethics studies coupled with skepticism regarding the progress of ethics in business studies as a backdrop to review the research dealing with the teaching of ethics within MBA curriculums in the U.S., and found that as of 1991, ethics studies had not taken hold as an integral part of business schools. Several years later, the importance of ethics studies in business programs had gained enough momentum that many researchers no longer questioned its importance. Gardiner and Lacy (2005) considered business ethics from the international perspective of the corporation’s role in society, and the responsibilities that arise as a result, as well as the responsibilities thrust upon business schools to prepare business students for their role as ethical managers. The two researchers appear to be among the first to use the terms CSR interchangeably with business ethics and the course title of Business in Society (BiS) interchangeably with business ethics.

More recently, Krishnan (2008) added to the research with a seven year longitudinal study, which included pre and post surveys (N=229) on the effect of a prominent Indian MBA
program on students’ values. Results showed that management education enhanced the importance of self-oriented values like living a comfortable life and pleasure and reduced the importance of others-oriented values such as being helpful and polite. Although the study is limited by its reliance on only one university, the results may be an indication that ethics education may be necessary simply to offset the self-orientated values, which graduate business and management programs may be instilling or reinforcing within students.

Gardiner and Lacy (2005) candidly stated that, as of 2005, there was no longer a question regarding the importance of ethics in business curriculum. Additionally, Krishnan’s (2008) research showed that business and management programs may be unintentionally creating self-orientation in students or fostering pre-existing attitudes toward self-orientation. Having established the popular theme among researchers that ethics education is indeed necessary for business students (Christensen et al., 2007; Gardiner & Lacy, 2005; Ghorpade, 1991; Sims & Sims, 1991), the question remains whether ethics studies significantly affect business and management students and if so, how best to teach ethics to business students.

**Effects of ethics education on business students.** Much of the research appears to indicate that ethics studies can indeed be effective for business students. As a foundation, Glenn’s (1992) survey of graduate and undergraduate business students (N=460) over the course of four years showed that taking a business ethics course positively affected the ethical judgment of students. Kavathatzopoulos’s (1993) interviews of students added to the evidence that ethics studies can positively affect students by demonstrating that simple instructions and training are sufficient to promote a shift in the way an individual solves business ethics problems, and that it is possible to assess an individual's ability to solve moral problems. In addition to higher ethical awareness, results also indicated that these students with ethics education took a stance
commensurate with a higher stage or schema of moral development, and they were generally able to make more developed moral judgments in situations involving coercion and control, conflict of interest, environmental destruction, paternalism, and personal integrity (Kavathatzopoulos, 1993).

Carlson and Burke (1998) also showed a link between college ethics instruction and the evolution of students’ thinking about ethical dilemmas by conducting pre and post course interviews of undergraduate business students (N=67), who were exposed to actual business ethics scenarios during a business ethics course. Prior to the course, students showed a "black and white" concept of ethics, but after the course, students showed the ability to appreciate the complexity of ethical dilemmas and flexibly regarding responsibilities of leaders in corporate ethical dilemmas. More than 10 years later, Simola (2010) used Rest’s Neo Kohlbergian approach as a framework to ask open ended interview questions to undergraduate students regarding their perceptions of the effects of a business ethics course. Students’ responses indicated that the course resulted in increased confidence in ethics-related skills and increased insight into the ethical dimensions of students’ own behavior. Students also indicated that the course provided them with earlier recognition of ethical problems and solutions, greater recognition of stakeholders, increased creativity in ethical problem solving, and enhanced ability to implement ethical action.

Lau (2010) also used surveys and vignettes on business students (N=708), and found that ethics education has significant value in improving students’ overall ethical orientation, which suggests that we can teach students ethics and students will make more ethical decisions after learning moral principles. This study also supports the premise that ethics education has a positive impact on students’ ethical awareness, sensitivity, and reasoning, and it helps justify the
existence of business ethics education through a focus on building competences to help students identify, analyze, judge, and evaluate ethical matters in business in order to apply ethics to real-life business decisions (Lau, 2010).

The previous studies provide some evidence that college instructors have the ability to help prepare business students for ethical challenges that they might face as managers (Glenn, 1992; Lau, 2010). The research also shows that students not only perceive their ethical awareness as improved after ethics studies (Simola, 2010), but that students indeed approach ethical dilemmas from a more advanced moral perspective after they are exposed to ethics studies (Carlson & Burke, 1998).

However, other research tells a different tale regarding the effect of ethics instruction on college students. Waples, Antes, Murphy, Connelly, and Mumford (2009) conducted a meta-analytic investigation of 25 empirical studies, with results indicating that business ethics instructional programs have a minimal impact on increasing outcomes related to ethical perceptions, behavior, or awareness. Other researchers argue that college students already have fully-developed moral character, and that ethics instruction will do nothing to change that (Cragg, 1997). Ritter (2006) also added that institutions should not be expected to alter such firmly planted characteristics, regardless of the quality of instruction.

Although every instructor in every business program may not have the ability to effectively improve students’ ethical awareness and moral reasoning, the research appears to show that it is at least possible to positively affect business and management students’ ethical awareness and moral decision making through ethics studies in the classroom. After establishing that instructors do have the ability to progress students’ moral development through classroom instruction, it follows that researchers would ask how to most effectively do so.
Methods of business ethics instruction. The AACSB (AACSB, 2010), which is the foremost business program accrediting body, requires ethics to be included in business curricula, and mentioned that institutions typically resort to one of three methods to incorporate ethics in business programs: reliance on a single ethics course, an ethics case study approach, or integrating ethics across the business curriculum. Research has yielded mixed results regarding the most effective of the three aforementioned choices.

McNair and Milam (1993) found that business faculty generally believed that ethics should not be taught in a stand-alone course, and 84% of respondents believed a written case study method to be effective in teaching ethics. Collins (2006) agreed with the case study emphasis, but promoted the inclusion of the case studies within a stand-alone course. Collins outlined a stand-alone business ethics course, which uses Kohlberg’s stages as the course’s scaffolding. Collins also suggested that the course be designed to become increasingly complex throughout the semester. Thus, students would begin at Kohlberg’s lowest stage of moral reasoning or Rest’s lowest schema, and eventually after enough hypothetical and real-world business ethics case studies, students would advance through the stages to a higher stage or schema.

Nelson and Obremski (1990) examined other teaching methods within a stand-alone course by using Rest’s DIT to survey a group of business ethics students (N=24), and determined that student-led discussions appear to be more effective than teacher-led discussions in producing moral growth. The research also confirmed Kohlberg’s (1978) findings that students are able to comprehend the moral reasoning of others at up to one stage higher than their own and will prefer the higher stage of reasoning.
Castiglia and Nunez (2010) suggested integration of ethics throughout MBA programs as a possible solution to their stated problem: failure on the part of business programs to successfully educate ethical managers. Castiglia and Nunez conducted a case study of a single business program to address the problem from the perspective of an educator or administrator attempting to overcome the barriers inherent in the integration of ethics throughout the curriculum. The authors attributed their success in incorporating ethics to the fact that the school already heavily valued ethics throughout other programs and courses, and the current value-laden culture reduced some of the hurdles to incorporating ethics, including the need to justify the presence of ethics in the MBA program.

MBA students examine difficult ethical conflicts and dilemmas faced by managers and organizations, anticipating issues they will confront in their careers. In so doing, they build a framework for thinking through the ethical implications of business decisions. Some of the current research indicates that the most effective manners by which to teach ethics are through a stand-alone ethics course or a combination of a stand-alone ethics and ethical studies integrated throughout remaining courses (Christensen et al., 2007; Collins, 2006; Swanson & Fisher, 2008). However, Castiglia and Nunez (2010) also argued that the most effective ethics education may likely occur through saturation. Saturation would likely happen within programs in which the ethics are incorporated throughout the entire program, with ethical considerations consistently resonating throughout discussions and assignments.

Overall, the research appears to support Kohlberg’s (1978) belief that students learn ethics best through hypothetical case scenarios (McNair & Milam, 1993) and facilitated discussions (Nelson & Obremski, 1990). However, researchers would likely not have progressed to the current state of research into how best to teach ethics to business and management students
had past researchers not first established the importance and prominence of ethics studies within business programs. Although Ghorpade (1991) and Sims and Sims (1991) discussed the resistance to ethics in business programs, Ghorpade (1991), Sims and Sims (1991), Christensen et al. (2007), Gardiner & Lacy (2005), Castiglia and Nunez (2010), and Collins (2006) all based their research off Kohlberg’s and Rest’s general assumptions that ethics can and should be included in business programs. The same general assumptions may be of use to security ethics education.

Applying the Research on Business Ethics Education to Security Programs

The above articles highlight the importance of exploring the most appropriate method for teaching ethics in organizational Security Management programs. One cannot help but notice that business ethics researchers were gathering descriptive data on the prominence, placement, methods of instruction, and the general need for ethics in business programs two decades ago (Ghorpade, 1991; Paine, 1988), and have progressed to discourse on the how to best teach ethics (Collins, 2006). These studies have some utility in determining a new way of approaching organizational Security Management education’s problem of practice. Researchers can build off these studies’ consistently stated need for ethics studies in business and management. For instance, application of Castiglia and Nunez’s (2010) notions of ethics saturation and emphasis on a values-laden program might help organizational Security Management program administrators to more easily incorporate ethics in their programs.

However, this research is positioned where the aforementioned studies were approximately 20 years ago (Paine, 1998): assessing the state of ethics studies and the need for ethics studies within the chosen area of study. Indeed, even the most basic descriptive research
into ethics studies in business programs such as Christensen et al. (2007) is beyond the current state of research into ethics studies in organizational Security Management programs.

External pressures from businesses and alumni have forced MBA programs to develop cross functional curriculums that integrate and connect functional streams of knowledge (Collins, 2006; Schlesinger, 1996). Like MBA programs, the nature of organizational Security Management requires graduate security management students to learn about cross functional knowledge and skills cutting across domains such as safety, emergency preparedness, budgeting, and facility management (Brooks, 2010). Collins (2006) suggests that MBA ethics professors should address ethical problems that arise by addressing ethical issues within the course content of each discipline such as accounting, marketing, and finance. In keeping with Kohlberg’s emphasis upon cognitive conflict and social interaction incorporated throughout a curriculum, organizational Security Management programs may also benefit from repeated student exposure to ethical considerations during progression through cross-discipline Security Management curricula with ever-present ethical concepts integrated as a theme throughout the assignments.

Ethics studies within organizational Security Management curricula potentially face the same challenges today that business ethics researchers such as Ghorpade (1991), Sims and Sims (1991), and Nelson and Obremski (1990) faced during the early 1990s: laying the foundation. Thus, the foundation can be laid for ethics studies in organizational Security Management in the same way that the above listed researchers laid the foundation for CSR or business ethics studies, with Kohlberg and Rest as a backdrop. The problem of practice remains constant for this study, and these articles simply serve as examples of the possible path that organizational security researchers might take as they research ethics in organizational Security Management programs.
Graduate business and management programs, which should have arguably the most direct parallels to graduate organizational Security Management programs (Becker, 1991), often emphasize CSR or ethics within the curriculum (Castiglia, & Nunez, 2010). Like business managers, the role of a security manager is to support the aims of the employing organization as opposed to a public safety representative who supports society and performs public service (Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006). When organizational priorities place business managers and security managers in difficult ethical situations, those managers would be well served to have some background in ethics related to security management decisions. Indeed, security management instructors should consider, like their MBA instructor counterparts, using Kohlberg and Rest as an instructional foundation to provide a safe environment for graduate students to critically examine their own ethics within the context of a business or management environment, but from a classroom setting (Collins, 2006).

Conclusion

A case can be made for the importance of ethics because security management is a core business function with many of the same managerial duties as other organizational management components (Nalla, 1996). Indeed, if CSR, ethical decisions, and ethical actions are important to managers in charge of accountants, finance, research and development, public affairs, and general executives, it follows that ethics should also be important to managers in charge of organizational security, especially upon consideration of the safety, reputation, and liability related repercussions associated with security breaches and mismanaged crisis responses.

Tombs and Smith (1995) emphasized that, crisis management, which is a primary duty of security managers, is connected to CSR since a responsible organization is one that seeks to avoid crisis. This avoidance of crisis is based upon the internal and external damage caused by
organizational crisis. Indeed, if the fundamental goal of security personnel is to provide protection against hazards and crisis (Fisher & Green, 2004), and the base-line interpretation of CSR and the common good arguably begins with safety and security for all people, then one could argue that security officers and security managers are central to an organization’s CSR.

For organizations to exhibit CSR, managers must recognize the impacts that their decisions have upon the organization and workers. Tombs and Smith (1995) also argued that a strong link exists between an organization’s ethical position and its level of crisis preparedness. Indeed, the same focus on the short-term reward, which may foster poor ethical decisions, may also create an organizational environment that is fertile for crisis and poor crisis management.

The relationship between an organization’s CSR and an organization’s ability to prepare for and respond to crisis as symbiotic (Tombs & Smith, 1995). Thus, the common good approach to CSR theory can be applied not only to large scale business decisions, but also as the basis for the daily activities of security officers, security managers, and security executives who work to protect organizations and employees from hazards and crises. However, one must also consider the manner in which organizational Security Management graduate programs are preparing security management students to apply CSR as part of their everyday duties such as crisis response and ethics investigations. Instructors might consider Kohlberg’s stages and Rest’s schemas as a foundation.

Kohlberg’s specific stages and Rest’s schemas of moral development are of significant interest from a practical perspective since they may be of use in efforts to simplify types of moral reasoning. Such simplification may be of value to security managers who will be required to understand possible types of moral reasoning among employees during investigative interviews. Additionally, security executives and security managers must exhibit advanced ethical
knowledge not only as an employee and a manager who is obligated to conduct business
operations in accordance with established policy, but also as the Chief Executive Officer’s
instrument for development of business conduct policy and management of employee ethical
decisions (Fay, 2006).

Perhaps most important to the justification for ethics in organizational Security
Management graduate programs was Kohlberg’s assertion that educators can advance moral
thinking by using cognitive conflict, social interaction, and democratic participation, while
emphasizing a positive moral atmosphere (Kohlberg, 1969; McDaniel, 1998). Thus, cognitive
conflict, social interaction and democratic participation should perhaps be considered as
instructional tools for graduate Security Management ethics instructors. Giacalone and
Thompson (2005) also found that students learn more about business ethics when material
focuses on views that the students can relate to. Additionally, Turiel (1983) found that students
listening to moral judgments from authority figures showed minimal levels of moral growth.
Thus, one might assert that students should be more active in their learning through social
interaction and positive moral atmosphere, if higher order moral thought is to develop.

Like Piaget’s equilibrium model and the dialectic process of Socratic teaching, Blatt and
Kohlberg (1975) confused students through moral dilemmas, and the students resolved the
confusion by elevating their moral reasoning, and advancing in their position on the situation.
This same method could be used to advance the moral development of graduate level
organizational Security Management students. Students could be exposed to ethical management
scenarios that are formulated to challenge the moral reasoning level of the majority of the course.
Instructors can then act as discussion facilitators either online or face to face. Instructors could
then continue the discussion by asking questions that further complicate the issue and make the
moral ground even more ambiguous. This method is intended to challenge the students to the point that they graduate to the next level or schema of moral reasoning. Further, the graduate organizational Security Management instructors should consider requiring students to act as facilitators as well, with the instructions that they are expected to inject similarly difficult supplemental information into the discussion scenario.

Although many people may not expect graduate instructors to effectively teach graduate students how to be moral citizens, graduate instructors of all types have a responsibility to reinforce and enhance students’ moral development within the parameters of a particular graduate program. Thus, graduate instructors can apply ethics training to the business, management, and security decisions faced by security managers. Indeed, they may have to do just that, since the ethical knowledge taught in K-12 schools is inadequate for handling many of the complex ethical dilemmas that managers face on a daily basis (Collins, 2006, p. 331). Additionally, Rests’s neo-Kohlbergian approach provides justification for the presumption that older students, such as those at the graduate level can enhance their moral knowledge through classroom exercises since moral development seems to be less dependent upon age than it is upon social awareness (Rest et al., 1999).

Weber and Gillespie (1998) reported that managers typically reason at stages two or three of Kohlberg’s stages, which are the stages emphasizing reward-seeking and peer influence respectively (Collins, 2006). Indeed, Weber and Gillespie’s (1998) research revealed that managers determine right and wrong based on reward mechanisms and peer approval (Collins, 2006). Additionally, Fraedrich, and Ferrell (2005) noted that ethical behavior is positively associated with customer trust, organizational reputation, and customer satisfaction, which all have a positive impact on financial performance (Collins, 2006). One might thus assert that
managers, even if not otherwise motivated to act ethically, might be more prone to adopt high ethical standards if adoption of such standards is shown to be in their best interests and good for business (Collins, 2006). Those managers are probably more likely to adopt those ethical standards if they have been educated on ethical teachings emphasizing the aforementioned direct business value to ethical action. Ideally, graduate organizational Security Management students would advance to the highest stages or schemas of moral reasoning, and apply such reasoning in their management decisions. Indeed, security managers should emphasize the need for social order found in stage four while progressing toward principles such as justice and liberty found in stage six (Kohlberg, 1978), all while using the ideals and logic represented in Rest et al.’s (1999) highest schema.

Researchers also found that security practitioners have ranked ethics among the most important aspects of undergraduate and graduate security curricula (Nalla 1996; Nalla et al., 1995). Additionally, graduate organizational Security Management programs, which should have arguably the most direct utility to security managers, should emphasize ethics within the curriculum for professional and practical reasons. The importance of ethics and education to any trade seeking professional status cannot be overstated. Thus the professional progress of security managers depends at least partially upon rigorous security schooling with an emphasis on ethics to advance the profession and practice of security management. Security managers and security executives are part of the business and organizational world, and their duties as crisis managers and ethics representatives place them as the organizational component arguably most linked to CSR. Like their counterparts in business, security managers and security executives face organizational priorities that place them in difficult ethical situations, and those security managers and executives would be well served to have some background in ethics related to
security management decisions. Given the importance of ethics studies to the profession and practice of security management, and in following with Kohlberg’s (1971) and Rest et al.’s (1999) research, graduate level security management instructors should consider using cognitive conflict, socialization, and a positive moral environment to provide a safe environment for graduate students to critically examine their own ethics within the context of a business, management, or security environment, but from a classroom setting (Collins, 2006).
Chapter 3: Research Design

Research Questions

When conducting qualitative research, one should consider asking central questions supplemented by several sub-questions (Maxwell, 2005; Creswell, 2009). The central or overarching research questions follow:

1. How do program description materials show that ethics studies are being incorporated into graduate organizational Security Management program curricula in the U.S.?
2. How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe (1) their definitions of ethics in security management, (2) the role that ethics play in security management as a practice and as a profession, (3) the role that ethics studies play in graduate organizational Security Management programs, (4) instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies within their programs, and (5) difficulties in teaching ethics and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum.

Research question one focuses on the overall prominence of ethics instruction within graduate organizational Security Management programs in the United States. This question also identifies if ethics studies are incorporated into individual curricula, and if so, how they are incorporated. However, the question also serves to gather information in order to group the organizational Security Management programs for initial sampling and theoretical sampling during later interviews. This categorization also helped ensure that interviews were conducted with educators representing organizational Security Management programs that require ethics studies and programs that omit the mention of ethics studies from program materials.
Research question two is the central focus of this study. One cannot understand or develop a theory on ethics studies in organizational Security Management programs without first understanding how security educators define ethics. Such an understanding of the definition of ethics to security educators lays a foundation for further understanding on the role of ethics to security management as a practice and a profession. Additionally, discussion on the role, instructional methods, and difficulties associated with ethics studies in graduate organizational Security Management programs provided insight into the current mindset of educators related to ethics and ethics studies. Since research question two focuses on educators’ opinions on ethics, ethics studies, and their roles in security management and security management education, they can likely only be answered through interviews. Such interviews are a key component of this study and the resulting identification of a grounded theory. The research questions in this study are intentionally broad and basic with the intentions of establishing an initial baseline for future research.

**Research Method**

Grounded theory differs from many other research methods in that grounded theory researchers do not start with a hypothesis to be tested. Other research methods and their hypotheses are typically built off some understanding of the subject, which necessitates some level of past research on that subject. After a thorough review of the literature, it became evident that there is a dearth of research into ethics studies in security management education. Thus, grounded theory appeared the most fitting research method for this study and its research questions because of the apparently limited amount of previous literature establishing any understanding of the role of ethics in security or ethics studies in organizational Security Management programs.
This research was conducted in two-phases. First, content analysis was conducted of the available program materials related to graduate organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. The program materials totaled 172 pages of text for analysis. Next, telephone interviews were conducted with a total of 15 program administrators and instructors within those programs. The interviews totaled 10 hours and 32 minutes of recordings, and 359 pages of transcribed text.

The aforementioned phases were used to uncover a grounded theory related to ethics in security management and ethics studies in graduate Security Management programs. Grounded theory is often used when researchers want to fill a void in existing literature, examine issues within an understudied group, or establish a new way of addressing a topic (Creswell, 2007). Grounded theory is also used to uncover an explanation for an occurrence or process, for which research or current understanding is limited (Charmaz, 2010). Grounded theory is appropriate for ensuring that data collected are rich and useful, and that the methods used to collect and analyze data are systematic and structured (Charmaz, 2010). Use of a grounded theory methodology also provides the ability to move beyond description as discussed by Creswell (2007), and create a theoretical visual model of security educators’ perceptions of the role of ethics and ethics education in security management and organizational Security Management programs.

**Site and participants.** The target population is graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the United States, and the instructors and administrators within those programs. This study includes regionally accredited and nationally accredited programs, online programs, face to face programs, and hybrid programs at for-profit institutions, non-profit institutions, private institutions, and state-funded institutions. The study also includes programs
that have a core program in another subject such as business or criminal justice, with a formal
collection in organizational Security Management. However, for clarification, some brief
discussion is in order regarding the terms associated with various security programs.

Kooi (2008) differentiated between security management and security administration by
describing the former as being focused on security applied in a business or organizational context
and the latter as a subset of overall security management. Ortmeier (2009) added that security
administration is restricted to the planning, and financial control aspects of a security manager’s
job. Thus, it seems reasonable to use either the broad terms “security management” or “security”
to describe the security education programs being studied. To further delineate, reference simply
to “security programs” seems overly broad, and was also avoided to minimize confusion with
those programs that focus on general crime prevention or general security topics, which are not
studied in an organizational context. This research also avoids referring to security education
programs as “corporate,” “business,” “private,” or “industrial” in order to avoid the implication
that this research does not apply to government or campus security practitioners and managers
studying security. Thus, “organizational Security Management” appears to be the most fitting
broad term by which to refer to these business and organizationally focused security education
programs. It is important to note that, although this study consistently refers to organizational
Security Management programs, many of the programs studied have varied titles, including
“security administration,” “security management,” or simply “security.”

Given the aforementioned variation in program titles, curriculum content and program
descriptions were used rather than program titles in determining which programs were studied.
Regardless of previous titles used to describe these types of organizational Security Management
programs, researchers have often defined the programs using, at a minimum, the study of the
areas of physical security, personnel security, information or information systems security, and
genernal security management (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2009; Kennedy,
1984). Some researchers also include an ever-evolving list of additional security subject areas
such as executive protection, general business, risk management, security investigations,
counterterrorism, and business continuity as security management subject areas (Becker, 1991;
Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2010). However, inclusion of the study of physical security,
personnel security, information or information systems security, and general security
management were used as the characteristics necessary to qualify as an organizational Security
Management program for the purposes of this study. Security administration, asset protection,
security science, protection management, business security, organizational security, and security
studies are all titles of various security education programs, which may be referred to as
organizational Security Management programs so long as the programs include the
aforementioned four areas of study, are business or organizationally driven, and do not fall into
the study areas described by ASIS International as homeland security or international security.

Once the appropriate programs were identified, interviews were conducted with a total of
15 program administrators and instructors from American organizational Security Management
graduate programs. However, in order to interview such a diverse group of instructors and
administrators, descriptive data was first gathered identifying organizational Security
Management graduate programs, and determining the existence and placement of ethics studies,
if any, within the curricula.

**Data collection.** American graduate programs concentrating in organizational Security
Management were located using various sources. First, the *ASIS Guide to College Security
Programs* (2010) was used as the foundation document to identify graduate security programs.
Next, search engines including Google, Degree Finder, Education-Portal.com, and GradSchools.com were used to identify any additional graduate security programs. Exhaustive searches combined with the use of the *ASIS Guide to College Security Programs* (ASIS International, 2010b) likely resulted in the identification of the vast majority, if not all of the graduate security programs in the U.S.

Security is an area of study with multiple definitions, which results in a society with no clear understanding of what security is (Brooks, 2010; Manunta, 1999). Brooks (2010) described one understanding of the definition of security as national security and the defense of a nation. Others might describe security as private services that protect people, assets, or information (Craighead, 2003). Still others would describe security as services that prevent undesirable loss to an organization’s assets (Post and Kingsbury, 1991). Thus, the title “Security” could not be relied upon as the final determinant of which programs were included in the study.

Once security related degrees were identified, programs were evaluated and grouped based on descriptions provided on school websites. The focus was on programs specific to organizational Security Management: business, corporate, or organizational security graduate programs. Several programs were eliminated from the study due to qualitative assessment revealing a programmatic focus on homeland, national, international, or regional security instead of organizational, corporate, or business security. The focus was general organizational Security Management or administration, so degrees in areas such as business continuity or information security were excluded because those areas focus on specific aspects of overall business, corporate, or organizational security. Any graduate Criminal Justice or MBA programs with formal concentrations in Security Management were included in the study as long as those concentrations were not focused on regional, national, or international security studies.
The search yielded 19 graduate organizational Security Management programs from private for-profit, private not-for-profit, private not-for-profit online, and state funded institutions. The programs were offered in a face-to-face format, fully online format, and hybrid format. Some of the programs were embedded within other degrees, such as Business or Criminal Justice. Other programs were stand-alone Security Management programs.

Once organizational Security Management degrees were identified and differentiated from homeland security or international security programs, descriptive data on ethics was collected using several methods. For the purposes of this study, the term “program materials” will be used to describe (1) graduate catalogues, (2) curriculums, (3) course descriptions, and (4) program description information available on the program web site. Program materials then were examined for evidence of ethics studies or an emphasis on ethics. Initially, the aforementioned program materials were searched electronically for keywords including “ethic,” “moral,” “corporate responsibility,” “CSR,” and “social responsibility.” Additionally, manual searches for indicators of ethics studies followed the electronic searches for key terms.

Program materials were also evaluated based on the three instructional methods described by AACSB (2010): the single course method, the case study method, and the integrated delivery method. All available program materials were searched for evidence of an institution’s use of a stand-alone ethics course, the case study method, or the integrated delivery method. Content analysis of the aforementioned materials from open-source program information provides a foundation for some much needed descriptive data on the prominence and placement of ethics studies within organizational Security Management graduate curricula. At this phase of the research, the program materials were used to group programs according to the presence of ethics studies in a program. Such groupings assisted in a later determination of which instructors and
administrators to interview to ensure appropriate theoretical sampling, and representation by the two types of Security Management programs.

After gathering text from available program materials, the data were inputted into NVivo 9, and coded. The coding process is detailed within the data analysis section of this chapter, since the coding process for text from program materials mirrors the coding process for later interview transcripts.

After using open source data to outline the prominence and placement of ethics studies in security programs, and coding the program materials for themes in ethics instruction, interviews were used to gain a deeper understanding of instructors’ and administrators’ lived experiences related to ethics studies in organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S.

Overall, 15 educators were interviewed, including eight program administrators and seven instructors. Interviews were conducted with educators from programs that include no ethics component in the program materials and programs with program materials showing required or offered ethics studies. Interviews were also conducted with instructors who teach Security Management ethics courses and instructors who teach non-ethics security courses within the aforementioned two groups of Security Management programs. All but two of the administrators interviewed also teach courses within their programs, and 13 of the 15 interviewees (86.6%) had experience as security managers. Of the 19 Security Management graduate programs identified, 14 (73.6%) were represented in by participants in this study.

Charmaz (2010) described initial sampling, within grounded theory research, as a starting point, and theoretical sampling as a tool to direct researchers’ continued interviews. The researcher’s network of contacts and program faculty web pages were used to identify an initial sample of accessible and willing program administrators and instructors representing each of the
groups determined by the previous content analysis of program websites. Since security management and security instruction is a relatively small community, the researcher’s position as a board certified security manager, security instructor, and doctoral candidate in need of assistance seemingly helped sway administrators and instructors toward willingness to be interviewed. Potential participants were contacted via telephone, and a script was read (Appendix A) requesting participation. Those who agreed to participate were later sent an informed consent form (Appendix B), which had previously been approved by the Northeastern University Institutional Review Board.

The population of instructors and administrators initially interviewed was diversified based on previously established descriptive data on the presence of ethics studies within particular programs. Interviews were conducted with instructors and administrators from two groups of curricula: (1) programs with ethics studies mentioned in the program materials and (2) programs without ethics studies mentioned in the program materials. This heterogeneous initial sampling allowed for expansion and refinement of the emergent theory (Glaser, 1978). Initially, one administrator from each of the two types of curricula was interviewed. Then, one ethics instructor and one non-ethics instructor was interviewed from each of the two types of curricula. Coding was conducted as the interviews progressed, and responses from participants often prompted alteration of questions, and removal of other questions from future interviews.

Theoretical sampling then began by using snowball sampling in which information gleaned from current interviews helped determine who would be used for subsequent interviews. Theoretical sampling was also used to explicate categories from the data until those categories fully reflected the qualities of respondents’ experiences (Charmaz, 2010). This interview cycle occurred first with administrators from programs within each of the two groups of curricula.
Often, administrators provided contact information of instructors within their program, which began or continued the interview and coding cycle for instructors. The previously described interview cycle also occurred with instructors. However, instructors were further stratified into two sub-groups: (1) instructors who teach ethics courses and (2) instructors who do not teach ethics courses.

Adjusted conversational interviews were used to collect data from administrators and instructors of graduate organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. This type of interview allowed for the necessary flexibility to identify concepts embedded in the interviews (Glaser, 2001). Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and edited to ensure participant anonymity. The transcripts were then sent to each interviewee for review and correction. Interviewees were given the opportunity to not only edit the transcript for accuracy, but to also add any information they thought relevant to the study. Additionally, field notes were taken by the interviewer during each interview, which were also later evaluated. Field notes contained notes on conceptualized ideas, which were used for conceptualized codes, and assisted in linking themes that were identified.

Interview questions focused on (1) interviewee’s definitions of ethics in security management, (2) the role of ethics to the development of security management as a profession, (3) the role of ethics to the practicing security manager, (4) the roles that ethics and ethics studies play in graduate organizational Security Management studies, (5) instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies, and (6) difficulties in teaching ethics and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum. Additionally, basic descriptive information was gathered regarding the curriculum, and the positions of the interviewees. Appendix C is the initial list of interview questions.
Figure 1 depicts the data collection process and the division of the organizational Security Management programs into two groups: (1) programs with ethics studies indicated in the program materials and (2) programs with no ethics studies indicated in the program materials. The figure further depicts the sampling and interview cycle for administrators within each of the groups until saturation was reached, which is a concept that will be discussed later in this chapter.
Figure 1. Data collection process for administrators.

Searched for Security Graduate Programs, and Identified and Separated Organizational Security Management from Other Types of Security Programs

Conducted Content Analysis of Available Program Descriptions, Curricula, and Course Descriptions and Grouped Programs into (1) Ethics Studies Mentioned and (2) No Ethics Studies Mentioned.

Group 1: Ethics Studies Mentioned
- Administrator Interview (Initial Sampling)
- Interview Coding
- Interviewed Administrator from another Program
- Interview Coding

Group 2: No Ethics Studies Mentioned
- Administrator Interview (Initial Sampling)
- Interview Coding
- Interviewed Administrator from another Program
- Interview Coding

Continued Data Collection and Coding Cycle until Saturation Point Reached.

Figure 2 again depicts the data collection process and the division of the organizational Security Management programs into two groups. However, the figure then differentiates between the interview cycle for administrators and that of instructors by describing the further sub-grouping of instructors into (1) ethics instructors and (2) non-ethics instructors within each of the two larger categories.
Figure 2. Data collection process for instructors.

- Searched for Security Graduate Programs, and Identified and Separated Organizational Security Management from Other Types of Security Programs
- Conducted Content Analysis of Available Program Descriptions, Curricula, and Course Descriptions and Grouped Programs into (1) Ethics Studies Mentioned and (2) No Ethics Studies Mentioned.
- Identified Instructors from each of the two Groups, and Divided them into Sub-Groups: (1) Ethics Instructors and (2) Non-Ethics Instructors.

Data analysis. Unlike other research methods, grounded theory requires constant comparison and conceptualization through transcription of interviews, evaluation of text, and generation of coding categories (Glaser, 1998). Thus, the discussions within this study on data collection and data analysis necessarily comingle to some degree since there is no clear line of delineation between data analysis and data collection within grounded theory research. Both
phases of the research involve identification and categorization of themes occurring through specific types of coding within two coding cycles: first cycle coding and second cycle coding.

During phase one, after program materials were collected from the program websites, the text was inserted into NVivo 9 qualitative data analysis software for coding and analysis. The text from the program materials was coded using three types of coding, which was divided into the two cycles. The first cycle included focused coding. The second cycle included axial coding, and theoretical coding. The coding process is described in detail in the next section. However, the first coding cycle for the program materials phase of the research differed slightly from the first coding cycle for the interview phase of the research.

While coding the program materials, focused coding was used during the first coding cycle. Focused coding involves narrowing the initial coding step to a particular area of focus, and it was used during the initial coding cycle of the program materials in order to reduce the text to only that which involved ethics studies. This made the data more manageable.

Analysis of the program materials was used to gain further insight beyond descriptive data, and gain an understanding regarding ethics studies in Security Management programs, as portrayed by the program materials, and courses. It should also be noted that the findings from the program material coding only reflect information that was presented in the program materials, and thus might be limited based off website or catalogue space requirements, or failure to update the text.

Next, phase two of the research began with interviews. Field notes were taken on each interview, and interviews were recorded and transcribed prior to coding. Data analysis was then conducted using NVivo 9. The data analysis was conducted following each interview. Open coding began here and involved coding of all information found within the interview text, and
conceptualization into numerous categories (Glaser, 2001). During the interview phase of the research, open coding was used for the first coding cycle, which requires the researcher to initially code all themes present in the data. This type of coding was used instead of focused coding because the interview questions allowed for an initial narrowing of the subject matter. Focused coding, however, was used during phase one because no other measure was in place to narrow the subject matter to be coded. During coding, memos were also created based on a line-by-line analysis of transcriptions and notes, with coding using NVivo 9 software.

As interviews were conducted, constant comparisons of new and existing data were used to identify small streams of data called codes. Those codes were organized and grouped into larger categories which were made up of numerous codes that are similar to one another. Additionally, if further grouping was necessary within a category, codes were grouped into subcategories based on similarities, and the subcategories were aligned under categories. Data was no longer gathered once a point of saturation was reached in a category. Saturation occurs when continued data gathering reveals no additional properties of a category (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Upon saturation within a category, data on other categories should be gathered and compared in an attempt to saturate these categories as well (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Upon completion of first cycle coding, a total of 178 codes were identified, which were divided into two categories (Appendix D). Next, second cycle coding began (Saldana, 2009).

Second cycle coding included continued refinement and reorganization of emergent categories and subcategories (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Thus, after gaining a larger view of the codes, subcategories, and categories, they were re-organized and refined for later development of themes and finally a theory. Second cycle coding began with comparison of categories and associated sub-categories through axial coding. Categories were
merged into new concepts, which yielded new categories. Upon completion of axial coding, five categories and seven sub-categories emerged, which housed 170 codes (Appendix E). Additionally, as new categories were developed through second cycle coding, those new categories and subcategories were also assigned rules for inclusion to identify the limits of a category.

Eventually, five core variables were identified: security management, ethics in security management, professionalism, security management education, and ethics studies within Security Management programs. These variables were believed to explain the thoughts and behaviors of the interviewees related to ethics in security management and ethics studies in organizational Security Management programs. Having identified core variables theoretical coding began. Previously collected data was selectively sampled for its perceived relevance to the core variables. This theoretical coding included a review of previous field notes, transcriptions, and memos, which had already been coded. However, the selective coding phase focused solely on data that relate to the core variable.

Specifically, theoretical coding occurred by fracturing data into segments, which were determined by the field note and transcription analysis. The data was then compared by sorting and memoing. Memoing occurred again within the final stages of the process, during which memos were used to document more abstract ideas. During this stage, memos were used to record ideas about codes and coded relationships as they emerged during data collection, data analysis, and during earlier memoing (Glaser, 1998). Memos were used to help conceptualize data, operationalize categories, and as evidence of connections between two or more coded categories of data.
The memos were then sorted, which involved reorganizing the previously fractured streams of data, which prompted new ideas for another round of memoing. This final sorting of memos was intended to connect the identified categories, and was the final stage in creating the themes that provide the framework for the grounded theory. The final grounded theory is presented in narrative format within the results section.

Finally, a focus group was gathered using a wiki on Wikispaces website, which allowed users to provide anonymous online feedback in an asynchronous manner. Research participants were invited to take part in a focus group discussion, during which the final visual models were presented and discussed online. The focus group provided a forum to allow for feedback regarding research participants’ interpretations of the final theoretical models, which assisted in vetting and refining the theory and associated visual models.

Figure 3 shows an overview of the data analysis process. In summary, specific codes are placed into sub-categories or categories. Once re-categorized, a core variable is developed and selective sampling occurs against that core variable. Themes are identified based on the categories that develop throughout the research, and an initial theory is identified and drafted based off those themes. The written grounded theory was then edited, and finalized for later synthesis with current literature on the topic. The coding, memoing, categorizing, and re-categorizing strategy described herein is meant to begin with a basic descriptive understanding of events or perceptions and evolve to a more analytical or theoretical understanding of the data, which is reflected through a final, written grounded theory.
Figure 3. Data analysis and coding process.
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Validity and Credibility

Maxwell (2005) described two primary threats to validity in qualitative research: researcher bias and reactivity. Researcher bias involves subjectivity on the part of the researchers. Reactivity is the effect of the researcher on the individuals being studied. Shweder (1980) mentioned that researchers must take care not to show bias by restricting data selected to only data that stand out to the researcher or data that only fit into the theoretical lens used by the researcher. Biases cannot be avoided, but one primary goal of qualitative research is the identification and mitigation of incorrect results due to researcher biases. Thus, a key task of the study is to understand how researcher values and expectations influence the conduct and conclusions of the study, and to explain how those natural expectations and values were dealt with during the research.

The researcher entered into this study with the expectation that ethics and ethical management should be important to security managers, and that the educators in Security Management programs being researched should acknowledge the importance of ethics studies in organizational Security Management curriculums. This expectation was handled by creating open-ended and objective questions free from any tone or implication that ethics should be included in security programs, or that ethics should fill a particular role within the practice and profession of security.

Hammersly and Atkinson (1995) described reactivity as the unavoidable effect of the researcher on the group or person being studied. In qualitative research, one does not aim to remove researcher influence, but to understand it and use it productively (Maxwell, 2005). However, basic steps were used to minimize reactivity, including the avoidance of leading questions during interviews.
Maxwell (2005) suggested strategies to overcome specific threats to validity. Several of these strategies were used in this study to add to the validity of the results. Maxwell mentioned that interviewers should avoid taking notes solely on what they think is important, and record the entire interview. Those interview recordings should later be transcribed to ensure that every detail is recorded instead of simply the information that the researcher found important. The study included voice recordings of phone interviews with program administrators and instructors. Those recordings were transcribed for accuracy. Bryman (2006) also emphasized the need for respondent validation, which includes systematic solicitation of feedback from interviewees. This method was used by paraphrasing participant responses during interviews to reduce the possibility of misinterpretations by the interviewer. This is not to say that the interviewee’s responses are automatically valid, but that they simply were not misinterpreted by the interviewer. Additionally, each participant was emailed a copy of his or her interview transcript, and given the opportunity to make changes. The text that was used for coding was the text that was approved by each participant.

Credibility refers to the confidence one can have in the truth of research findings (Bowen, 2005). Maxwell’s (2005) techniques of searching for discrepant evidence or negative cases, and triangulation were also used to maximize credibility. Negative case analysis was used as a source of verification (Padgett, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1990), and is shown during several instances within the results section of this study. Negative case analysis also consisted of reexamination after completion of initial analysis, to determine applicability of the perceived emergent themes to the whole of organizational Security Management education. Thus, attempts were made to locate negative cases or disconfirming evidence. In addition, an anonymous wiki focus group was created to solicit feedback from interviewees. The models that were based off
interview findings were posted to the wiki, and interviewees posted anonymous feedback related to the models. The focus group added another layer in the search for discrepant evidence by allowing study participants to vet, confirm, or comment on the final models. Participating members of the focus group agreed with the models that were based on the interviews.

Finally, triangulation was completed by locating multiple sources of data to corroborate apparent findings or conclusions. Evaluation of program materials, as well as interviews with instructors and administrators, and comments provided in the wiki offered several sources for comparison. Although validity and credibility are important to any research, the importance of ethical considerations and protection of human subjects cannot be overstated.

**Ethical Considerations and Protection of Human Subjects**

Researchers should place ethical considerations among the most important facets of research (Cousin, 2005; Creswell, 2009; Maykut, & Morehouse, 1994; Patton, 2002). Researchers should also emphasize protection of research participants and avoiding deception while promoting the integrity of research in general (Creswell, 2009). One must also guard against impropriety that would reflect negatively upon the researcher, the committee, and the institution (Israel & Hay, 2006).

Providing confidentiality and gaining proper approvals are two more ethical considerations that were addressed in the study. The names of individual interviewees were held confidential, with interviewees assigned an identifier. Additionally, since the researcher used telephone interviews with administrators and instructors, approval was implied partially by their willingness to be interviewed. However, potential interviewees were also asked to acknowledge receipt of the informed consent form (Appendix F), which explains the research, and requests participation. The approval form also informed potential interviewees that, although interview
text will be published in this study and possibly in future journal articles, the text will never be identified with a name or the institution to which the interviewee belongs.

Patton (2002) recommended that research subjects should also benefit from the research to some degree. Program administrators will benefit from learning how their program compares to other programs in ethical studies. Cousin (2005) also suggested that interviewers should consider the emotional damage caused by the tone of the interviewer and depth to which one questions a subject. None of the questions were harmful or involved intimate information, and the final written product does not single out any one program with negative attention.

**Conclusion**

The grounded theoretical framework and models, which follow in the next chapter are intended as a foundation for future research. This grounded theory research used deliberate sampling methods for collection of data, systematic coding and data analysis, while incorporating numerous checks and balances to maximize validity and credibility. The research is intended to advance or perhaps begin the body of work related to ethics in security management while maintaining the necessary academic rigor for doctoral research.
Chapter 4: Report of Research Findings

The research yielded quantitative and qualitative results. Phase one results came in the form of quantitative-descriptive data, which helped paint the picture of general Security Management graduate education, as well as ethics studies within those programs. Phase two results came from qualitative data analysis, which resulted in the development of several visual models and written theory.

Phase I Findings

Research question 1. How do program description materials show that ethics studies are being incorporated into graduate organizational Security Management program curricula in the U.S.?

Research revealed that 19 institutions offer graduate degrees related to organizational Security Management studies in the U.S. Those graduate degrees consist of graduate degrees in Security Management and other graduate degrees in Sports Management, Business, or Criminal Justice with concentrations in Security Management, or a similar title. These programs are focused on organizations instead of national security concerns, and include a mixture of risk management, security management, and physical security studies as defined by (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2010; Kennedy, 1984).

Overall, the available program materials indicate that 15 of the 19 programs (78.9%) either require or offer ethics studies. These studies are provided either as a stand-alone course, by integration throughout the curriculum, in a final capstone course, or in a combination of a capstone course, stand-alone course, or multiple course integration. Table 1 shows that 11 (57.9%) of the programs require ethics studies and four programs (21%) only offer optional ethics studies in some form. In addition, four (21%) of the programs with ethics studies include
both required ethics studies and optional ethics studies in other phases of the curriculum. Of the
programs that have an ethics component, 73.3% require ethics studies and 26.6% offer optional
ethics studies. Additionally, four programs (21%) listed ethics or ethical knowledge as a
program goal or outcome, which constitutes (26.6%) of the programs that include some form of
ethics studies.

According to program materials, a total of eight programs (42.1%) use a stand-alone
course for ethics studies. Six programs (31.5%) have a mandatory ethics course and two
programs (10.5%) contain an optional ethics course. Of the programs that offer or require ethics
studies, 53.3% use a stand-alone course to teach ethics.

According to program materials, a total of 12 programs (63.1%) integrate ethics
throughout more than one course. Nine programs (47.3%) integrate ethics into mandatory
courses and three programs (15.7%) integrate ethics studies into optional courses. Of the
programs that offer or require ethics studies, 80% integrate ethics.

Program materials indicate that six programs (31.6%) include a stand-alone ethics course
as well as ethics integration. Of the programs that offer or require ethics studies, 40% include
both integration and a stand-alone course. Additionally, four programs (21%) include ethics
studies as a component of the program’s final capstone course or thesis option. Of the programs
that offer or require ethics studies, 26.6% include ethics in the final capstone or thesis option.

None of the program materials mentioned an ethics case study as an option or
requirement within the course descriptions, curriculum description, or program overview.
However, the available program material may not necessarily be the location in which a case
study assignment is described.
Table 1 depicts the presence of ethics studies within graduate organizational Security Management programs as described by the available program materials for each program. One limitation of this part of the research is that the accuracy of any assumptions related to the descriptive data is limited by the availability of program materials. At a minimum, all programs provided a program description, graduate catalogues, and course descriptions. However, having all the program materials does not alleviate the need for program materials to accurately reflect the prominence of ethics studies. Program materials may not mention ethics studies, but ethics studies may indeed be integrated into courses, but not mentioned in the course descriptions. This in fact occurred in all of the programs with program materials indicating no ethics inclusion. Subsequent interviews with administrators from the programs showing no ethics inclusion revealed that the programs did indeed incorporate required ethics through several other courses. Thus, another limitation is that assumptions about ethics studies in Security Management programs are only as good as the material reflected in the course descriptions, program descriptions, and graduate catalogues.

Additionally, the small number of organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S. limits the generalizability of the results. Thus, the results should probably not be applied to other security-related areas of study. There is also a possibility that all organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S. may not have been located or that the available program descriptions, course descriptions, and graduate program catalogues may not have provided an accurate reflection of ethics studies in the programs. As a result, the descriptive results that follow should not be considered to be without the possibility of error. However, given the exhaustive search for programs, one might presume that the programs in Table 1 make up the vast majority, if not all of the graduate organizational Security Management
programs in the U.S., and the resulting descriptive data is thus at least a proximal reflection of the prominence and placement of ethics studies within the population of those programs.
Table 1. Ethics studies in organizational security management graduate programs in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Program Goal (MBA or CJ w/Sec Focus)</th>
<th>Ethical Knowledge Listed</th>
<th>Method of Inclusion of Ethics Studies</th>
<th>Capstone Integration</th>
<th>No Ethics Studies Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henley Putnam U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Ethics Course</td>
<td>integrated throughout</td>
<td>✓ *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Denver UC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devry U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern College</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Kentucky U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Maria Coll</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State U</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Detroit Mercy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Miss U</td>
<td>Sports Mgt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster U</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>required</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ethics mentioned within the course description of a single, non-ethics course.*
Table 1. Ethics studies in organizational security management graduate programs in the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Program Goal</th>
<th>Method of Inclusion of Ethics Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single Ethics Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey City U</td>
<td>Sec Mgt</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island U-CW Post Campus</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMU/APUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Houston-Downtown</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue U</td>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern U</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ethics mentioned within the course description of a single, non-ethics course.
A basic word frequency analysis was also conducted to add some additional context to the descriptive data. After gathering information, grouping programs, and removing the material that is not related to curriculum or course content, the word frequency analysis was conducted from the remaining text. The results were limited to the 100 most used terms within the curriculum and course related program materials. Table 2 shows the results of the word frequency analysis reporting the 100 most-used terms as being relatively evenly divided into two categories: (1) security management studies and (2) educational terms. Of the 56 security management terms, many were related to organizations, management, security, systems, and technology. Some of the remaining 44 educational terms included terms such as “course, student, concept, evaluate, program,” and “study.” The figure displays the terms in descending order from most used to least used. The term “ethical” was ranked as the 55th most used term overall, and the 31st most used security management related term.

Table 3 represents the topics listed consistently throughout the Security Management programs. Each of the 29 topics appeared at least twice as part or all of a course title. Additional security or management related topics such as safety, white collar crime, and security training instruction were listed in course titles, but were not recurring. Table 3 shows that the term “ethics” is used in course titles within seven (36.84%) of the programs.
Table 2. Word count of 100 most commonly used terms in graduate security management programs in America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weighted %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>2.57 %</td>
<td>decision</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.31 %</td>
<td><em>ethical</em></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1.72 %</td>
<td>making</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.30 %</td>
<td>financial</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>techniques</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1.50 %</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.30 %</td>
<td>have</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.76 %</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>including</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>credit</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0.73 %</td>
<td>identify</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>programs</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.18 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.63 %</td>
<td>methods</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.61 %</td>
<td>your</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>safety</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.58 %</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.29 %</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.58 %</td>
<td>hours</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.27 %</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>international</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminal</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.55 %</td>
<td>legal</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.27 %</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>role</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.54 %</td>
<td>principles</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.27 %</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.48 %</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.27 %</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.44 %</td>
<td>operations</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.27 %</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.44 %</td>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.25 %</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.21 %</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.39 %</td>
<td>crime</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.25 %</td>
<td>learn</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.20 %</td>
<td>develop</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.39 %</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.25 %</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.20 %</td>
<td>impact</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.38 %</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.24 %</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.20 %</td>
<td>practices</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.38 %</td>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.24 %</td>
<td>personnel</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.20 %</td>
<td>prerequisite</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.17 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.38 %</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.37 %</td>
<td>response</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>studies</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.20 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.35 %</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>description</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.34 %</td>
<td>design</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>examines</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.33 %</td>
<td>provides</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.33 %</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.23 %</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>topics</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.33 %</td>
<td>also</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.33 %</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>theories</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.32 %</td>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.22 %</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.19 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bolded** terms are directly related to topic areas within security management studies.
Table 3. Topics listed within course titles in graduate security management programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Listed in Course Title</th>
<th>Number and Weighted % of Programs with the Topic in a Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management/Business Continuity/Crisis Management</td>
<td>14/ 73.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Security Management/Corporate Security</td>
<td>14/ 73.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability/Risk Assessment</td>
<td>12/ 63.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>11/ 57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Law</td>
<td>11/ 57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems Security</td>
<td>11/ 57.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Administration</td>
<td>9/ 47.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting/Finance</td>
<td>7/ 36.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>7/ 36.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Security</td>
<td>7/ 36.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Theory</td>
<td>6/ 31.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>6/ 31.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Investigations</td>
<td>6/ 31.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>5/ 26.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>4/ 21.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Program Planning and Evaluation</td>
<td>4/ 21.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Issues</td>
<td>4/ 21.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence Studies</td>
<td>4/ 21.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Theory and Concepts</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Protection</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss Prevention</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Protection</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Security Management</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Security</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Factors/Behavior</td>
<td>3/ 15.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Violence</td>
<td>2/ 10.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles/Theory of Security Management</td>
<td>2/ 10.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Auditing/Fraud Examination</td>
<td>2/ 10.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Safety</td>
<td>2/ 10.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Analysis of program materials.** Coding of the program materials was done in the same manner as the interview text. However, analysis of program materials resulted in a significantly more straight-forward result. Figures four and five detail the themes identified within the program materials, which related to ethics studies in graduate Security Management curricula. Essentially, program materials indicate that ethics studies are paired with other topic areas such as legal issues. Within those courses, students are exposed to (1) the role of ethics in an organization and in a profession, (2) traditional ethical theory, and (3) ethical decision making. Students are evaluated by traditional written assignments and exams, as well as required analysis of security management ethical scenarios, and explanation of ethical concepts either orally or in writing.
Programs Cover Ethical Decision Making in Courses Through:
- Analysis of Ethical Decision Making
- Education on the Benefits of Ethical Decision Making
- Evaluation of Ethical Scenarios within Courses

Programs Address the Ethical Requirements of the Profession in Courses Through:
- Covering Ethical Obligations
- Covering Ethical Standards

Programs Pair Security Ethics Studies with Several Other Areas of Study:
- Prejudice or Racism Related Topics
- Business Related Topics
- Professionalism Related Topics
- Legal Studies
- Social or Political Issues

Ethics Studies are covered within Non-Security Courses within Programs:
- Criminal Justice
- Information Technology
- Management and Leadership
- Marketing

Evaluation of Ethics Knowledge Occurs Through:
- A Final Thesis, Capstone, or Exam
- Required Explanation of Ethical Concepts
- Evaluation of Ethical Scenarios within Courses

Programs Address Ethics' Role in Organizational Performance

Programs Address Traditional Ethical Theory
Figure 5. Model for ethics in security management education as reflected by program materials.

Structure
- Security Ethics Studies Paired with Other Areas (Law, Professionalism, etc.)
- Ethics Studied Within Non-Security Related Courses (CJ, Marketing, etc.)

Content
- Ethical Decision Making
- Ethics’ Role in Organizational Performance
- Ethical Requirements of the Profession
- Traditional Ethical Theory

Evaluation Methods
- Final Exams, Theses, Capstones
- Required Explanation of Ethical Concepts
- Evaluation of Ethical Scenarios in Courses

To Address
Which, are evaluated by
Phase II Findings

Research question 2a. How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe their definitions of ethics in security management?

Every participant emphasized the importance of ethics to security management, and many went so far as to describe ethics as interwoven into security, and inseparable from security management. However, educators defined ethics in security management in differing ways. Some educators focused on adhering to professional standards and obeying the law while some educators focused on honesty or simply “doing the right thing” during the numerous opportunities that security managers face to be unethical. Other educators focused on promoting CSR within the organization and outside the organization by modeling appropriate ethical behavior or by making decisions in an unprejudiced and unbiased manner. Below are some quotes representing the participants’ responses.

When I look at ethics in security management, I’m really looking at ethics within the larger organization first. And I look at it as somewhat practical side and that is how do we promote an ethical corporation or an ethical agency. And then I’ll take it a little bit deeper into the security department and not only how do we promote ethics within the corporation as a whole, but how do we promote it within our particular department and how do we model it too? (Interview 15)

Ethics represent professional standards and normative expected behaviors from all professionals in conducting their responsibilities in their day to day work in a fair and equitable manner. (Interview 6)
But in the end, it's just quite simply… making sure you'd do the right thing in any situation that arises. (Interview 11)

Given these varied definitions for ethics in security management, one might surmise that each of the interviewees was at least partially correct, and simply described a definition that was most telling of their experiences. Thus, security management ethics will be described as striking a balance between organizational ethics, personal values, legal and liability concerns, international custom, and one’s professional ethical code in order to model ethical behavior by making morally reasonable and ethically sound security and management decisions. Such decisions are made through evaluation of situations, and making decisions that most align with societal norms and the organization’s ethical stance, while maintaining the individual security manager’s personal values and professional code. Figure 6 depicts a visual model of the aforementioned description of ethical decision making in security management. The exterior circles represent the factors, which must be weighed when making an ethical decision. The center circle represents the final ethical decision making and modeling for organizational employees based on the balancing of the factors represented by the outside circles.
Research question 2b. How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe the role that ethics play in security management as a practice and as a profession?

Ethics in the profession. Although security management is on its way to becoming a profession, it does not fully meet the requirements of a profession.

It's not a true profession at this point and the reason I say that is because we don't have any sort of mandated international or national body which says, "Due to your experience and testing, you are now a professional." (Interview 12)
Educators stated that any trade hoping to become a profession must establish (1) education programs, (2) a body of knowledge, (3) a required certification or licensure, (4) a code of conduct, and (5) a system of enforcement for breach of the code. In describing security’s lack of professional status, educators cited security’s (1) minimal body of work, (2) lack of required licensure or certification, and (3) lack of professional body with realistic process for identifying ethical breaches, or revocation authority to keep violators from practicing the security trade.

We’ve got ASIS International but there is no real mandatory professional body. You have to actually have to be a part of so, whose shoulders does it fall on to enforce this as a profession? (Interview 12)

Ethics and education are both fundamental to the public and organizational leadership’s perception of security management as a true profession.

Yeah, I think the professionals and the ethics and continuing our education all kind of go hand in hand. I think as you learn more in your respective field, and you recognize that, just that it provides a level of awareness, which enhances the professionalism of the people that work in that industry. (Interview 5)

Although security is still not considered a true profession by many, the importance of security, and subsequently, security professionalization, have gained momentum. This increased momentum was due in part to the 9/11 attacks. After 9/11, organizations became more aware of the need for a legitimate and dependable security component. As a result, the need for enhanced respectability, professionalism, and education among organizational security gained prominence and organizational leadership placed an increased emphasis on hiring security personnel with advanced education and experience, which provided momentum toward increased security education programs, certifications, and industry regulation.
And it's 9/11. Well, I shouldn't say if it's 9/11. I'm going to say, in the '70s slowly than '80s and then the '90s that came about the - like the ethical standards and professionalism of security, basically, had to be raised to win that level of - to become a professional, which we appeared then to be. After 9/11, it was a complete turnaround to the aspect of - basically, it's not only do you have to perform your position, but you have to do it in the highest ethical standards possible. And that's when ethics really came about within that security professional and they are more scrutinized than anything. Probably, more today, because the fact is this now they are more educated. (Interview 3)

Security personnel’s increased contact with the public places them as representatives of their organizations and the security trade. This exposure further increases the need for professional perception, since the impressions security personnel make on the public will no doubt reflect upon the organization and security as a trade. From a management perspective, many of the decisions made by security managers can significantly affect public perception of the organization, as well as expose the organization to civil liability. Such consequences reinforce the need for security managers who are competent and capable.

*Ethics in the practice of security management.* Every security function is built off the presumption of trust, and that trust does not exist without ethical decision making by organizational security personnel.

It fits in to a lot of what I said earlier but specifically, in every aspect to their job, there's an element of trust in what they do and there's an assumption that security professionals have a higher standard of ethics in protecting, you know, assets and people. So, in their daily function whether it's a Security Officer or a Chief Security Officer, I think, that ethics in everything that we do is critical. (Interview 8)
The reason that ethics are particularly important to security managers is basically because when you're a security manager… as a security manager, you have the keys to the kingdom. You are the person who is tasked to secure the most valuable assets that the organization has and of course, in today's world, just could be on the IT side or it could be physical, usually, it's a combination of both. And so, because you are given access to those sorts of things, ethics becomes extraordinarily important in security management.

(Interview 12)

Well, ethics is the foundation with everything security personnel do. I mean, that's the bottom line. It's the ethical standards that basically play the most important part within that profession. (Interview 3)

I think ethics is a paramount consideration for security managers just like law enforcement officers. Whether we like it or not, we're held to a higher standard. (Interview 11)

Breach of that trust removes credibility not only for security management as a profession, but the organization, and the individual security manager. Then, the security manager’s past decisions, investigations, and actions are questioned. Additionally, security managers who lose that trust will find themselves lacking credibility inside the organization and outside the organization. Such loss of trust and credibility places security departments and security managers in jeopardy of removal due to ineffectiveness.

If the executives think you’re a waste of money because you're - you know, having unethical practices or you're doing things that – are even perceived as being shady; you will have a hard time convincing leadership to give you the resources so, that aspect alone is the most critical. (Interview 10)
I think that, you know, ethics underlies trust. And security managers, as all managers have to have, have to be trusted in their competencies and also trusted in their decision making and that the decision making will not expose the corporation or the agency to a legal liability, will not expose it to the adverse publicity. So I think ethics is a fundamental underlying principle and also a fundamental underlying behavior expectation. The corporations that have quality preparations of their security managers and if the security manager’s absent, they’re lacking in those, in the issue of perception being ethical, I think in a straightforward high valued company that that person will probably ultimately be removed from his position. Yeah, without ethics security managers would be ineffective. Because it’s such an integral part of their job, every task they do. (Interview 15)

Ethics permeates through every aspect of security management, and one could argue that an organization’s willingness to create and fund an organizational security component is a reflection of an organization’s dedication to business ethics or CSR, because of security’s emphasis on personal safety as well as identification of, and investigation of ethical infractions in the organization.

You know, if you’re willing to invest to the security program, then obviously there’s behavior that is unacceptable to the organization. And also that includes, if the organization itself is engaged in illegal practices or unethical practices, and there’s some place that you can turn to within that organization to report that conduct. I think there is a statement there. I think security, pro-active security, really does reinforce that ethical culture. And then if you have reinforced ethical culture, I think you can reinforce
performance and productivity across the board. So I would say certainly we perform them. That’s part of what we do, but that’s not all what we do. (Interview 15)

However, an alternative argument is that security cannot be a reflection of an organization’s CSR, since security is inherently a form of self-preservation for the organization. Another educator argued that the existence of a security program is not a reflection of CSR because one can be concerned with safety and security of others, while still being deeply unethical.

You know, the other, I guess, the other argument has been that - well, you know, you created ethics - you know, I'm sorry. You created an organizational Security and Emergency Preparedness in your organization as a function of your, you know, self-preservation, you know, and so that's why people would maybe argue that it's not supposed to be or that is not a reflection of your CSR. It's actually the reflection of your selfishness. (Interview 10)

I admire people who feel that way. I don't necessarily agree with what you're saying. The reason that I say that is because I think you could be probably quite unethical, and still, you know, I have to drive to save people's lives and that sort of thing. (Interview 12)

Ethics literally starts at the top of an organization, and cascades down. Thus, security managers often find themselves having to decide between “what my boss is telling me to do and what I know is right.” Security managers are often put in situations in which they are being asked to complete a potentially unethical assignment or ignore an obvious ethical violation at the direction of senior management. Security managers must thus understand their values and how their personal ethics align with a potential employer. Such internal reflection may be facilitated through ethics-related concepts in security management education.
It is important to have the perception of that group to be such that they’re thought of as highly ethical people and, you know, that standard of professionalism comes from whoever is in-charge. I think the leader and the example they set, there’s a trickle-down effect from that. When you get somebody at the top, that causes, I think, a spillover of unethical conduct all the way through the organization. (Interview 14)

An additional concern is that ever increasing globalization is exposing security managers to significant variations in normative values among different cultures. Security managers now find themselves facing more complex ethical scenarios in an environment in which the ethical dilemma may not even constitute an ethical violation within the country or culture the security manager is currently immersed in.

The more responsible the security manager’s position is within the organization, the more important ethics become. Ethics are arguably more important to security managers than to other organizational managers for several reasons:

- Although security personnel have similar authority to law enforcement within an organization, they are not bound by the same laws and restrictions that limit law enforcement. Thus, organizational security personnel are required to exhibit ethical discretion for reasons other than legal limitations.
- Security managers have access to employee personal information.
- As internal investigators, security managers often serve as the ethical example within an organization.
- Ethical failures by security managers can negatively affect the public’s perception of the organization.
• Security managers reduce loss through ensuring organizational functionality, and maintaining the integrity of human capital as well as other organizational assets.

• Security managers model ethics for security workers and train them on matters related to ethics in security.

• Security is viewed as a cost center instead of a profit center. Thus, security managers find themselves justifying the existence of the security department because no profit is gained as a result of the department, and the cost savings produced by security are often not immediately quantifiable. If senior executives perceive the security entity to be of suspect ethical fiber, they will cut off funding because of the necessity for the aforementioned trust. Thus, ethical knowledge and action among security managers is indeed a tangible necessity for career survival.

• A security manager’s success depends upon reputation both among organizational leadership and among organizational workers. Ethical failures interfere with security managers’ ability to be relied upon with people’s personal information, with company secrets, with people’s safety, or during investigations, to be trusted with the truth from witnesses.

• Ethical infractions resulting in failed emergency response or security measures can result in injury or death, as well as civil liability and negative press.

• Security managers’ duties as investigators, organizational representatives, and gatekeepers to organizational information and resources make them more likely to face situations, which may tempt them to make unethical decisions.

Organizational emergency planning and security measures must be approached from an ethical standpoint, otherwise they are meaningless. Thus, continuity, emergency, and security
plans are rooted in an ethical foundation. Although these plans are motivated ethically, peoples’ actions are often not ethically motivated during emergency situations. Indeed, ethical decision making is affected by the severity of events. As a result, ethical decision making among security managers becomes even more important because security personnel are often on-scene commanders who make leadership decisions until emergency personnel arrive during emergency situations.

Figure 7 depicts interviewees’ descriptions of the interrelationship between the trust necessary as the foundation for security management, and the duties of security management, which consistently expose them to ethical decisions. These ethical decisions are made while operating within an organizational environment that places security personnel in a position in which ethical failures are likely to result in more significant consequences than other organizational personnel. The large box represents the organizational environment for security managers, with text dispersed throughout describing organizational environmental factors, which foster the need for ethical decision making and increase consequences for ethical failure on the part of security managers. The large circle inside the box represents the job of the security manager, and a few of the many day-to-day tasks, for which trust is a requisite. The boxes at the bottom of the figure show the increased likelihood of ethical dilemma and the increased consequences for ethical failure, which foster an increased need for ethical decision making and moral reasoning among security managers.
Figure 7. Security management duties, organizational environment, and ethics.
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Increased Consequences for Ethical Failure by Security Management
Figure 8 depicts the enhanced consequences resulting from ethical failures by security personnel, which were described by interviewees. The figure shows immediate consequences such as loss of trust within the organization for security, negative publicity for the organization, and immediate failure of the security mission such as failed crisis response, security breaches, and failed internal investigations. The figure then shows the transition from immediate consequences to subsequent consequences.

Figure 8. Consequences associated with ethical failure by security personnel, and results of the loss of trust in security.
Research question 2c. How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe the role that ethics studies play in graduate organizational Security Management studies?

Security management education. An emphasis on broader context security understanding, critical thinking, communication skills, globalization in security, and strategic level security management decision making were consistent themes throughout a majority of the interviews. Graduate Security Management programs were also said to help students recognize fundamental security and management practices and principles, while understanding important issues in the profession.

However, educators expressed differing opinions regarding specific structure and goals of graduate Security Management programs. Some educators emphasized strictly academic goals such as the theoretical or conceptual issues of security management with no regard for preparing students for certifications. Other educators believed the programs should focus on theoretical or conceptual issues while also emphasizing preparation for board certification by studying key aspects of the CPP exam. Still other educators focused on theoretical or conceptual issues while focusing on the core functions of security, which they acknowledged happened to fall in line with the requirements of board certification.

Educators emphasized that a primary goal of security management graduate education is to prepare students how to create mental frameworks by which to approach and assess complex organizational security problems both in the U.S. and abroad, while incorporating a multi-disciplinary perspective (ethics, shrink prevention, public perception, immediate safety, needs of other organizational entities), and communicating reasonable solutions to organizational leadership. Security management education is also seen as a primary means to prepare students
to understand the international context, which is increasingly important as globalization becomes more prominent.

Graduate organizational Security Management education is also necessary to expose students to the competing priorities they will face during security management decisions both ethically and from a public affairs standpoint. This is especially important given the significant number of law enforcement and military personnel attempting to transition to security management positions. Thus, graduate organizational Security Management programs are meant to help overcome the limits to a person’s thought process, which are often caused by their past experience in law enforcement or the military. In short, prior law enforcement or military students must be re-trained from a public safety mentality to an organizational emphasis. This is especially important given the new situations they will likely face as a security managers. Security managers who transition from law enforcement or the military must adjust to having less authority while balancing organizational goals, and the immediate negative publicity that the organization could face as a result of a poor security or management decision.

You know you don’t have the authority you used to have and I think that’s a real distinction some guys have a hard time making. They still pursue things as though, you know, they were on their old, you know, wearing the other hat. That can lead to problems and complaints… it’s one thing if you’re in the government, you know, you might handle a protestor completely different than you would if you were in the private sector. You know, if you come on too strong, you might get negative press over some kind of confrontation and that’s the last thing they want to have the organization portrayed with. (Interview 14)
**Ethics studies.** Ethics education is equally as important as any other topic within security management education, and security programs lacking ethics studies are lacking fundamentally. However, ethics studies are sometimes not taken seriously as an academic topic. Some educators explained that graduate students have pre-formed ethical frameworks, which result from their significant work experience, and which reduces the need for overt focus on ethics. Other educators also stated that ethics are being incorporated, but no clearly defined topical focus using the word “ethics” is used.

Educators generally don’t believe it is their job or the job of Security Management programs to show students the “right way to be ethical” because there is no right way, especially given varied cultures, organizational CSR priorities, and ages represented by students. Graduate students are viewed as unlikely to be receptive to attempts at value-reshaping, because of their significant work experience, and they often enter classes with pre-determined ethical frameworks. However, ethics studies force these more experienced students to hear other viewpoints from instructors and students, and they often benefit from such exposure. They are known to make comments along the lines of “I never thought of it that way” because they are exposed to group discussion with other students from different backgrounds.

Educators expressed a belief that their role is to prepare students, within the safe confines of the classroom, to build mental frameworks to help them address the type of scenarios and ethical decisions they may face related to ethics in security management situations. Simply put, security ethics education is more about exposure to security management ethical scenarios and decision making than it is about re-shaping values or a step-by-step process.

Ethics studies are necessary to expose students to ethical decision making applied within the context of security management. This also allows students to face security management
related ethical dilemmas while keeping students safe from potential negative repercussions of poor decisions. This is especially important for the significant population of security management students who are new to the security field. Security management education’s partial focus on globalization also assists in exposing students to the significantly more complicated ethical dilemmas occurring internationally.

Ethics studies are also necessary because security management has no mandatory professional body such as the American Psychological Association or American Bar Association to require a mandatory body of ethical knowledge for all security managers through required licensure testing. Thus, including ethics studies in education programs is the only way for the security management profession to disseminate ethics-related information throughout its ranks.

Education has the effect of causing the idea of ethics and the importance of ethics to be permeated throughout the professional body of security management. (Interview 12)

Figure 9 depicts interviewees’ descriptions of the current role of ethics education in Security Management programs. The need for ethics education is reinforced by a lack of required ethical testing or required ethical action by security managers. Additionally, minimal outside training opportunities and training materials related to ethics in security management place education programs as the fundamental tool for ethical information dissemination within security management.
Program materials. Interview of educators revealed that, although several of the programs make no mention of ethics in their program materials, all of the programs require ethics integration through several courses, within a stand-alone course, or through both. However, programs may fail to list ethics studies in the program materials. Although everyone agrees that ethics are very important to security education, mention of ethics in program materials is not viewed as something that will draw potential students to programs. Another educator hypothesized that ethics may be so inseparable from organizational security that programs simply overlook the need to explicitly state that ethics are addressed within program materials. Still other educators cite the need to focus on tangible-content related language to describe the program, since the program material must pass through the school review board, which focuses on content-related language. Additionally, program materials are sometimes created by non-subject matter experts. This, coupled with relatively frequent turnover among
program administrators, may result in long-standing and inadequately worded program and course descriptions.

**Research question 2d.** How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies within their programs?

Although educators agreed that the most effective form of ethics instruction varies by class, they generally agreed that the most effective form of ethics education is any measure which engages the students, and requires them to explain ethical concepts and their own moral reasoning. As a result, case studies with student or instructor facilitated discussions were generally viewed as the most effective form of ethics assignment, while lecturing was viewed as the least effective form of ethics instruction. Additionally, multiple choice exams were viewed as the least effective form of ethics evaluation. One educator also described success with requiring students to write a code of ethics and explain or defend the code.

It is also important to make a distinction between determining that students are understanding and retaining concepts versus determining if ethics instruction is successfully changing students’ behavior. Educators cannot measure whether ethics studies are actually changing students’ behavior, nor should they attempt to create measurements for such. They can only measure whether students understand concepts, which they have exposed them to.

I don’t think we can measure whether were changing their behavior. I think we can measure whether they have grasped some concepts and idea, whether they can analyze and can identify an ethical issue and analyze it and address it. But as to actually changing behavior, I don’t think we are able to evaluate that in the classroom. (Interview 15)
Disagreement exists regarding the structure of ethics studies within a curriculum. Some educators believe that ethics should be incorporated throughout several courses, and not left to a single course dedicated to ethics studies. Others believe a stand-alone ethics course is necessary in order to teach the theory, background, and history of ethics, which can provide a foundation for ethics applied to security management. The stand-alone course should also be supplemented with ethics incorporation throughout several courses in order to facilitate ethical decisions applied to those types of scenarios throughout the various security domains. Strict reliance on ethics incorporation throughout multiple courses results in the glossing over of ethics in each area.

**Research question 2e.** How do instructors and administrators of graduate level organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. describe difficulties in teaching ethics and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum?

None of the educators could identify a text related to ethics in security management. Many of the educators agreed that lack of security ethics tools is hindering the study of ethics in security in a few ways. First, programs often use instructional technicians to develop courses. Often, these technicians build courses based off designated texts. Thus, if available textbooks do not include security ethics, curriculums won’t incorporate security ethics courses. Additionally, many security instructors come from law enforcement or military backgrounds, so they don’t have real-world security management ethical scenarios to present to students. As a result, they need to rely more upon texts or other materials. If no materials exist, how can there be quality examples or cases for evaluation? Finally, lack of available security ethics texts is also minimizing the amount of security ethics courses created because courses are typically created using a textbook as the foundation. Security ethics are currently being taught using criminal
justice or business management instructional tools and texts. Many educators believed the current educational tools are limiting the quality of instruction, since security-specific ethical studies are necessary. Educators expressed other difficulties in teaching ethics:

- Students often have such varied cultures that individual values differ significantly, making it difficult to attain buy-in from the class.
- Instructors sometimes struggle to overcome students’ stereotypes of ethics as a boring subject area.
- Some students come into the class without having formed any value set, and having not really ever created their own internal moral framework.
- Ethics instructors may unintentionally inject their own personal values, which stem from military or law enforcement training, into their ethics teachings.
- Lack of security specific ethical education materials, such as textbooks, limits breadth of teachings and course outline.
- Instructors often have only law enforcement or military background, so their experience with security and grasp of security management specific ethical dilemmas limits the case studies they can present to students, especially with no available texts.

Educators also described a few difficulties associated with curricular incorporation for ethics studies. Program administrators’ pre-conceived notions and decisions regarding the inclusion of ethics studies can be a barrier in incorporating ethics into a curriculum. Indeed, ethics cannot exist within a curriculum without the support of the program administrator.

Additionally, graduate programs are often limited to 10 to 12 courses, which limits opportunities to include ethics studies, especially given the numerous other security domains that must be addressed.
Conclusion

The results found herein represent basic, descriptive findings on the prominence and placement of ethics studies in organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S. Additionally, interviews with educators provided further insight into educators’ perceptions of (1) a definition for ethics in security management which involves balancing of several factors for each ethical decision, (2) the significant role of ethics and trust as the foundation for the practice and profession of security management, (3) the significant, yet often overlooked role of ethics studies in graduate organizational Security Management programs, (4) instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies, and (5) barriers and difficulties to teaching ethics and including ethics studies in a curriculum. The following chapter will provide a discussion on the findings and how they relate to the current body of work for security management.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Some doctoral dissertations limit the amount of additional research to be introduced within the discussion section. However, many grounded theorists recommend re-visiting salient literature after one’s grounded theory is complete in an effort to determine the new findings’ role in the current literature (Charmaz, 2010). Indeed, some grounded theorists go so far as to recommend that researchers not complete a literature review prior to the data collection phase in order to minimize potential re-direction of research focus prior to allowing the data and findings to guide the theory development (Charmaz, 2010). This discussion section will seek to not only tie the research findings to the findings from the literature review, but also to incorporate the findings with previously unexplored pathways as well.

The purpose of the first research question was to gain understanding of the overall state of ethics studies in graduate organizational Security Management programs, according to available program materials. The purpose of the second question was to ascertain the context, situation, and definition of ethics in security management and ethics studies in organizational Security Management graduate programs as perceived by program administrators and instructors.

It should be noted that this discussion unfolds more organically by veering away from an outline based strictly off the research question order. Simply put, this discussion will not parallel the order of the research questions, as findings open pathways for discussion somewhat unrelated to the initial research question. However, prior to any discussion occurring, one must understand the limitations associated with this research and with any attempts to compare findings to past research.
It should also be noted that the limited number of organizational Security Management programs limits generalizability of results, so descriptive findings should not be applied to all security degrees. Additionally, lack of a single source cataloguing all Security Management degrees leaves room for error in finding all Security Management graduate programs. Finally, findings based solely off descriptive results are limited to information provided in program descriptions, course descriptions, and program catalogues.

**Defining Ethics in Security Management**

The interviewees’ inability to form a consistent definition for ethics in security management is a clear indication of the need for this research. Interviewees did, however, provide pieces of the larger concept of ethics in security management. These findings were especially appropriate given past authors’ focus on application instead of theoretical concepts.

Trautman (2008) and Hertig (2008) each addressed ethics in organizational security management by focusing on the role of security managers in supervising and training subordinate security officers to make ethical decisions and act ethically. Both authors also emphasized the need for security managers to develop ethical behavior among subordinates by modeling ethical behavior and incorporating ethics training and requirements for subordinate security officers.

Trautman’s (2008) statement that organizational leadership, at all levels, must promote an ethical focus was echoed by several interviewees in this research. However, Trautman’s (2008) assertion that hiring practices and internal training practices are inadequate in promoting ethics was not addressed by interviewees.

Hertig (2008) focused on applied ethics in security, and emphasized a few approaches to creating a focus on ethics among security officers: (1) display a code of ethics in the workplace,
model ethical behavior, (3) require security officers to sign an ethical code annually, (4) create a supervisory relationship in which subordinates feel comfortable seeking feedback related to ethical decisions, (5) conduct proper workplace training to increase job knowledge and decrease unprofessional behavior, and (6) have security officers attend ethics training.

Hertig (2008) also used the acronym PORT to describe an ethical decision making model, which can be applied by the practicing security manager or security officer. First, security personnel must define the problem, and consider writing a problem statement to assist in defining the variables. Next, the options must be assessed. This step goes beyond options that are immediately apparent, and asks decision makers to consider every imaginable option. Third, decision makers should evaluate and prioritize their responsibilities to different entities, such as the organization or a supervisor. Finally, decision makers are asked to consider if the decision will stand the test of time, and be a decision that the individual is proud of in a decade.

The theoretical model developed in this research complements Hertig’s (2008) focus on applied security ethics and how to make an ethical decision. However, the model developed in this research focuses more broadly upon defining ethics in security management as an overall practice and profession, as opposed to recommended approaches to an ethical decision.

Analysis, refinement, and compilation of educators’ descriptions of ethics in security management resulted in the following definition: Striking a balance between organizational ethics, personal values, legal and liability concerns, international custom, and one’s professional ethical code in order to model ethical behavior by making morally reasonable and ethically sound security and management decisions. Such decisions are made through evaluation of situations, and making decisions that most align with societal norms and the organization’s
ethical stance, while maintaining the individual security manager’s personal values and professional code.

**The Role of Ethics in the Practice and Profession of Security Management**

Educators consistently listed trust as the foundation of organizational security, and described numerous repercussions for breach of that trust. Thus, ethical knowledge and action are literally the foundation of organizational security, and embedded in everything security personnel do on a daily basis. Although many professionals can claim an overt reliance upon ethics, few can directly link ethical failure by practitioners so directly to career failure, organizational failure, and professional failure. Additionally, many of the respondents also described the very existence of organizational security and emergency preparedness as a reflection of the organization’s emphasis on CSR. Thus, it appears that CSR was a fitting theoretical framework as a foundation for ethics in the practice of security. Indeed, one might argue the social contract alluded to within CSR theory is reflected by investment of funds into a department, with the sole purpose of protecting personnel and assets from harm or loss, both inside and outside the organization.

Fort (1996, 1999), argued that business should be considered a mediating institution and that it should only positively contribute to society, and not harm society. Business should contribute to the common good through creation of wealth and efficient provision of goods and services. Through application of the common good approach to CSR theory to organizational security management, one might assert that business should uphold fundamental rights of individuals in society through the installation and continued support of protective measures and emergency preparedness capabilities related to the organization, its workers, and the community wherein it lies.
Mele (2002) argued that business contributes to commerce, which often facilitates peaceful and friendly living conditions for those within a community, thereby fulfilling its CSR role. This research indicates that perhaps organizations are also adding to an organization’s CSR role by further creating friendly living conditions within a community by creating a safe and secure environment on organizational grounds, and mitigating any spillover of unsafe conditions into the outlying community. Alford and Naughton (2002) also suggested that businesses are responsible to the common good of the wider community. What better way to fulfill that responsibility to the community than by mitigating negative results of crime, security breaches, or failed crisis responses?

The debate, however, remains as to the motivation behind creation of a security department. Some will say that, if the security department was created for reasons other than a perceived duty owed to employees and the public as a part of that organization’s place in the web of society (O’Brien, 2008), that security department is not a reflection of the organization’s CSR orientation. The question of motivation may only be answered on a case-by-case basis. Simply put, some organizations may create a security department because it is “the right thing to do,” while others may invest in a security department as a form of risk abatement, to reduce insurance costs, or to reduce exposure to civil liability. One might look toward the robustness of the security department as one piece of evidence as to the organization’s intent, and CSR orientation.

Tombs and Smith (1995) also argued that a strong link exists between an organization’s ethical position and its level of crisis preparedness. Interviewees also agreed with Tombs and Smith (1995), who emphasized that crisis management, another primary duty of security managers, is connected to CSR because crisis planning is rooted in ethics. Some interviewees stated that ethical decision making is affected by the severity of events, and perceived necessity
created by crisis can create a type of sliding scale related to ethical decision making. As a result, ethical decision making among security managers becomes even more important because security personnel are often on-scene commanders who make leadership decisions until emergency personnel arrive during emergency situations. Thus, the investment in security personnel and emergency plans may be another form of reflection of an organization’s CSR since the organization is using funds to inject its own personnel, resources, and planning to mitigate the potentially hazardous ethical decision making of crisis victims. Other findings were important to security’s development as a profession.

Educators were in agreement with other researchers (Black & Hertig; Simonsen, 1996), who stated that any trade hoping to become a profession must establish (1) education programs, (2) a body of knowledge, (3) a required certification or licensure, (4) a code of conduct, and (5) a system of enforcement for breach of the code. In describing security’s lack of professional status, educators agreed with Khurana et al.’s (2005) emphasis on ethical enforcement in determining professional status. Educators cited security’s (1) minimal body of work, (2) lack of required licensure or certification, and (3) lack of professional body with realistic process for identifying ethical breaches, and (4) lack of revocation authority to keep violators from practicing the security trade as reasons for security’s lack of professional status.

Black and Hertig (2008) also posited that the public must perceive a particular field to be a profession for it to be so. Security personnel’s increased contact with the public further increases the need for that professional perception. Interviewees emphasized security’s consistent exposure to the public as evidence that security personnel are making some sort of impression on the public. The question is whether the specific interaction will enhance or detract from the public’s already lacking perception of security as a true profession.
Importance of Ethics in Security

Security personnel conduct background investigations, protect executives, investigate internal fraud, plan crisis responses, ensure physical security systems are protecting workers and assets, and myriad other duties, which place them in the public spotlight and require enhanced authority and access to information. Further, no clearly defined set of laws limits the actions of security personnel, unlike their counterparts in public law enforcement who are subject to the criminal justice system of checks and balances to minimize unreasonable infringement of rights.

Regardless of the role the security manager is performing, this research showed an increased likelihood of the need for ethical decision making as well as heightened consequences for ethical failure. All of the consequences, however, stem from the loss of trust for the security manager or security department by the public, organizational leadership, or workers. Consequences include financial loss for the organization, physical harm to workers, civil liability, reduced revenue, dissolution of the security department, and removal of the security manager upon loss of trust. This research also determined that Security Management programs teaching ethics provide future or current security managers with the only relatively safe environment in which to practice ethical decision making, and learn from mistakes without facing real-world consequences, such as the ones previously listed. The aforementioned characteristics of security positions and the significant consequences for ethical failure only serve to reinforce the importance of ethical decision making among security managers. A primary way of enhancing all decision making in security management is through education.

Security Management Education

Although interviewees had differing opinions regarding the role of graduate education in preparing students for professional certification, one might still expect many of the topics
covered in graduate organizational Security Management programs to at least partially align with the topics tested by the Board Certification Exam in Security Management, even if by chance. One can see an intersection between education and board certification, as both are characteristics of a profession (Khurana, Nohria, & Penrice, 2005) and both should seek to ensure an adequate knowledge base and proficiency among security managers.

The word frequency analysis and the course title analysis also add some context by reflecting the prominence of security-related terms among program materials, and course titles respectively. The course title analysis revealed that 29 security topics were used repetitively throughout graduate Security Management programs. For this comparison, the 29 identified topics were compared to the security domains and associated security tasks described by ASIS International (2010a) as components of the CPP exam. Comparison of the course topics to the domains and tasks in the CPP exam (ASIS International, 2010a; Appendix F) allows for some basic understanding regarding the alignment, if any, of graduate Security Management course topics with the required knowledge domains and associated tasks tested in the CPP exam.

Legal aspects make up 7% of the CPP exam, and the topic is tied for fourth most used course topic with 57.8% of programs including the topic in a course title. Similarly, information security constitutes 8% of the exam, while the topic is tied for fourth most used course topic with 57.8% of programs including the topic in a course title.

Business principles and practices constitute 11% of the CPP exam, and the topic is tied for 8th most used course topic with 36.8% of programs including budgeting and finance in a course title. Security principles and practices, which account for 19% of the CPP exam, are heavily emphasized by programs, as reflected by 100% of the programs including topics that make up security principles and practices. General security was included as a course topic in
73.6% of programs, vulnerability and risk assessments were included in course titles in 63.1% of programs, loss prevention was included in course titles within 15.7% of programs, and security auditing was included in course titles within 10.5% of programs.

Other security course topic representation does not align so readily with the CPP exam content. Although crisis management makes up only 8% of the exam, the topic receives seemingly disproportionate representation among programs, since it is tied for the most used course topic with 73.6% of programs including the topic in a course title. Security investigations constitute 10% of the CPP exam, and the topic is tied for 11th most used course topic with 31.5% of programs including the topic in a course title. Additionally, while the domain of physical security makes up the largest portion of the CPP exam at 25%, and the topic is consistently described as a key element of security management (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz and Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2010; Holladay 2003; Kennedy, 1984; Richards, 2004), the topic is only tied for 8th most used course topic, with 36.8% of programs including physical security in a course title.

The course title analysis revealed another unexpected trend in that there was minimal mention of personnel security, which is a topic consistently described as a foundation of security management studies (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz and Gibson, 2006; Brooks, 2010; Holladay 2003; Kennedy, 1984; Richards, 2004), and makes up approximately 12% of the questions on the Security Management Board Certification exam (ASIS International, 2010a). However, workplace violence is addressed as a course topic in 10.5% of the programs and human resource management was also included in a course title in 21% of programs. These two topics are listed by ASIS International (2010a) as key tasks of personnel security.

Although some security topics are represented somewhat consistently between the CPP exam and graduate Security Management programs in the U.S., other areas, such as physical
security, personnel security, and crisis planning or emergency management represent a significantly higher percentage of the CPP exam than one might predict based on representation by Security Management graduate programs. This lack of symmetry should probably be no surprise, given the varied responses of educators related to the purpose of American graduate Security Management programs.

Administrators showed disagreement regarding the goal of graduate organizational Security Management programs. Administrators were split between the opinion that (1) programs should only focus academically oriented conceptual or theoretical aspects of security, and certifications are not of concern, (2) programs are intended to create professionals, so they should be oriented toward the board certification topics as well as security theory, and (3) programs are intended to address security theory and core aspects of security management, which also parallel the core knowledge areas of the CPP certification. However, the program was designed with certification requirements in mind.

These results show that education may, depending upon the program, help prepare students for professional certification. Along with education and certifications, ethical standards are another often cited requirement of a profession (Khurana, et al., 2005), and the research findings indicate that ethics education also plays a considerable role in the professionalization of security.

**Ethics Education in Security Management**

This study uncovered a model depicting a need for ethics education that is reinforced by a lack of required ethical testing or required ethical action by security managers. Additionally, minimal outside training opportunities and training materials related to ethics in security management combined with a large influx of law enforcement and military personnel with no
security experience place education programs as the fundamental tool for ethical information dissemination within security management. Interviewees agreed with Trautman’s (2008) assertion that the security profession’s code of ethics is not meaningful enough. In addition, interviewees added that the lack of mandatory certification or enforcement capability for ethical violations further weakens ethics in security. However, some have questioned whether ethics can even be taught.

Although scholarly debate once occurred regarding whether ethics can effectively be taught (Gardiner & Lacy, 2005), the answer may not be a simple “yes” or “no.” The answer may be that, at least within the security management realm, it simply does not matter. This research revealed that security management students are coming from law enforcement and the military in droves, and many of them have not experienced the types of ethical dilemmas they will face as security managers. Additionally, those ethical dilemmas, if handled incorrectly may have catastrophic results for the individual security manager, the organization, and the security department. Thus, one might argue that ethics studies are mandatory if only to expose security management to such decisions within an environment in which lives and careers are not at stake. Indeed, the interviews confirmed that there is a significant difference between hoping that an instructor can make someone into a moral person vs. an instructor providing a student with the knowledge and decision making abilities to recognize and evaluate a moral dilemma when one arises. This research corroborated past researchers’ (Hartman, 2006; Izzo, Langford, & Vitell, 2006) comments that instructors cannot "teach" students in a manner that forces them to make a certain decision or take a certain action. Such actions are based off personal values, and presumably other factors such as the ones depicted in Figure 6. This was also highlighted in Kavathatzopoulos’s (1993) study, which suggested that ethics education can enhance some
aspects of students’ moral reasoning, especially in situations involving coercion and control, conflict of interest, environmental destruction, paternalism, and personal integrity, which apply directly to security managers. Thus, ethics can be taught, and graduate organizational Security Management programs in the U.S. are using varied methods to incorporate ethics studies.

**Incorporation of ethics studies within the curriculum.** Of the programs that include ethics studies, 42.1% use a stand-alone course to teach ethics. Although program materials, indicate that a total of 12 programs (63.1%) integrate ethics throughout more than one course. Follow up interviews with administrators clarified that an additional four programs include mandatory integration of ethics studies through multiple courses. Thus, 84.2% of the programs that include ethics studies do so through integration throughout more than one course. Program materials indicate that six programs (31.6%) include a stand-alone ethics course as well as ethics integration. The possibility remains that programs with a stand-alone ethics course failed to mention additional ethical integration within program materials. Thus, according to the program materials, 40% of programs that include ethics studies use both integration and a stand-alone course.

Some educators believe that ethics should be incorporated throughout several courses, citing a limited number of courses in the graduate program. Others believe a stand-alone ethics course is necessary in order to teach the theory, background, and history of ethics, which can provide a foundation for ethics applied to security management, and that reliance upon ethics incorporation throughout multiple courses results in the glossing over of ethics. Baetz and Sharp (2004) may have backed up the latter argument when they evaluated 25 popular business administration texts, and identified a consistent lack of treatment of ethical theory within the texts. Their findings may be an indication that failure to set aside a dedicated course, and
subsequently a dedicated textbook related to ethics, could indeed result in a glossing over of ethics within a curriculum or in a text.

As ethical studies become more prominent in Security Management education, administrators will likely seek the best manner by which to deliver the information. This argument is currently underway in business education research, which is showing a similar level of disagreement regarding ethics incorporation in curricula. Castiglia and Nunez (2010) found integration throughout the entire program to be most effective while Collins (2006) recommended the use of a stand-alone ethics course. The best option is likely a combination of a stand-alone ethics course to teach ethical concepts and theory, followed by incorporation of ethics into other security topics. This approach allows for a solid foundation followed by application to the various roles of a security manager.

**Barriers to incorporation.** This study’s findings, like Castiglia and Nunez (2010), indicate that failure on the part of administrators to embrace ethics studies may be among the largest barriers to incorporation of ethics studies into a curriculum. Indeed, Castiglia and Nunez (2010) found that success or failure of ethics studies may depend heavily upon the fostering of an ethical culture within a program, which interviewees of this research indicated is created by (1) administrator support of ethics studies and (2) instructors modeling ethical behavior. Additionally, the recent increase in ethical studies in MBA curriculums (Christensen et al., 2007) may also provide some motivation for graduate security program administrators to increase the prominence of ethics in organizational security graduate studies.

**Prominence of ethics studies.** The program materials, word frequency analysis, and course title evaluation highlight ethics as at least one of the more prominent topics with graduate Security Management programs. The program materials indicate that ethics studies are included
in more than 78% of the organizational Security Management graduate programs in the U.S., with more than 57% of the programs requiring ethics studies. However, follow up interviews indicated that program materials failed to mention the integration of ethics studies, and that 100% of the programs actually include ethics studies, with more than 78% requiring ethics studies.

The basic word frequency analysis results reported the 100 most-used terms as being relatively evenly divided into two categories: (1) security management studies and (2) educational terms. Of the 56 security management terms, many were related to organizations, management, security, systems, and technology. The term “ethical” was ranked as the 55th most used term overall, and the 31st most used security management related term. The course topic analysis showed that the term “ethics” is used in course titles within seven (36.8%) of the 19 programs. Only seven other topics were included more often as course topics, and all of the terms were primary aspects of security management: crisis management, risk assessment, security law, security administration, research methods, budgeting and finance, and information systems security. However, ethics was included as a course topic more times than 19 other terms, which placed ethics within the 25% of the topics listed in course titles.

This is seemingly a promising start, especially given the lack of regulation over security education, and security education’s relative youth. However, interviewees’ consistent emphasis on ethics and trust as the foundation of security management implies that ethics studies should perhaps take even more prominence in Security Management programs. Another concern is the theme that ethics studies are only given “lip service” in these programs as opposed to being recognized as a core aspect of security management, worthy of formal study.
Although all of the graduate organizational Security Management programs identified require or offer some form of ethics, one might assert that security’s placement as an ethical resource in businesses and as a field requiring the public trust would prompt every security program to require ethics studies at several points throughout the program. Additionally, if security stakeholders expect to increase the professional status of security, the field will surely need to enhance the prominence of ethics beyond the codes of conduct established by organizations such as ASIS International and the International Foundation for Protection Officers. Increased focus on promoting ethics in security education will help ensure that future generations of security managers and executives are aware of and prepared for the myriad of business, management, and security related ethical dilemmas they will surely face throughout their careers.

**Comparison of prominence to similar programs.** Having presented findings on the prominence and placement of ethics studies in Security Management graduate programs, the results can be compared to what are arguably the two most similar types of programs: (1) Criminal Justice and (2) Business Management. However, one must first consider the limitations of such comparisons. First, of the 19 organizational Security Management programs studied in this research, three were Criminal Justice programs and two were MBA programs, each with concentrations in Security Management. As a result, the study security, business, and criminal justice all have a seemingly equal claim on those five programs, which complicates attempts at comparison.

Another limitation to fair comparison is the difference in sample groups. The relatively low number of graduate Security Management programs in the U.S. has allowed this study to represent what is likely close to the entire population of graduate organizational Security
Management programs in the U.S. However, the sheer number of graduate Criminal Justice and Business programs in America greatly reduces the likelihood of any past researchers studying the entire population of any type of program. Thus, researchers have studied subsets such as the Top 50 business programs (Christensen et al., 2007), or programs that have available online program descriptions (Sever, Coram, & Meltzer, 2008).

Sever et al. (2008) used open-source program materials to assess the content of graduate-level Criminal Justice programs (n=118) in America. Sever et al. (2008) found that program materials reflect that 40% of the Criminal Justice programs offer or require an ethics course within the program, which is similar to the 42% of organizational Security Management graduate programs offering or requiring an ethics course. However, Sever et al.’s (2008) analysis was focused on general curriculum analysis, and thus did not drill down into ethics integration throughout numerous courses. This removes from consideration a number of Criminal Justice programs that integrate ethics throughout numerous courses, and would likely reduce the overall number of Criminal Justice programs reported with ethics inclusion.

Comparison to ethics in graduate Business programs may also be valuable, given the similarities between graduate Business programs and organizational Security Management programs (Becker, 1991; Bordzicz & Gibson, 2006; Holladay, 2003). Christensen et al. (2007) studied the prominence of ethics within the top 50 global Business schools as ranked by Financial Times during 2006. The authors found that not only were all 50 programs requiring some form of business related ethics studies, but more than 33% of the programs have further applied CSR and environmental sustainability in addition to general business ethics studies. As was briefly mentioned previously, interview of educators revealed that, although a few graduate Security Management programs failed to mention ethics in their program materials, every
graduate organizational Security Management program included ethics. Indeed, the few Security
Management graduate programs, which failed to mention ethics in the program materials still
included integration through more than one mandatory course. Thus, Security Management
graduate programs provide at least a similar emphasis on ethics studies. However, a few of the
Security Management programs include ethics studies as an optional course or integrated within
optional courses. Failure to require ethics studies and exposure to security management related
ethical scenarios is a significant concern, given the stated importance of ethics and trust to
security managers. As with comparison to graduate Criminal Justice programs, the
aforementioned comparisons are also limited by differing populations since what is likely the
vast majority Security Management programs in the U.S. are being compared to the best 50
MBA programs throughout the world.

Limitations notwithstanding, one might see the prominence of ethics studies within
organizational Security Management programs as promising. Criminal Justice and Business
programs both have significantly longer histories than Security Management programs, and
Business programs have the benefit of at least three fully-developed business accrediting bodies,
which enforce standards among programs. It is also worth mentioning that all of the Business
programs studied by Christensen et al. (2007) are accredited by America’s foremost Business
program accrediting body, the AACSB, or Europe’s counterpart, the European Quality
Improvement System (EQUIS), which both require ethics studies (AACSB, 2010; EFMD, 2007).
Thus, it should be no surprise that the top business schools are requiring ethics studies so
consistently, since they are all subject to ethics studies requirements set in place by the top
Business program accrediting bodies. This may also be a relevant point in the argument for a
security program accreditation.
Implications of development of a security program accreditation body. The ASIS
International Academic/Practitioner Symposium, which is arguably the foremost body dedicated
to developing security education, is described as an international forum for promoting ongoing
communication and dialogue between security academics and security practitioners (ASIS
International, 2008a). The Symposia have met yearly since 1997 in an effort to combine
experience and expertise of the security educators and practitioners to gain a consensus regarding
security education, “to discuss and debate issues and trends in the field, and to take actions that
can result in the development of educational programs at the baccalaureate and graduate levels
that respond to those cutting-edge issues” (ASIS International, 2008a, p. 1). Symposium
members acknowledged the importance of security accreditation by addressing the necessary
components of such an accreditation.

The Symposium determined that the 18-point security model, which includes specific
aspects of security, should be used as the framework for security curriculum accreditation. The
Symposium also described several requirements for programs, including certified instructors,
emphasis on security research, and a required capstone course. Although ethics was not
specifically listed as one of the security 18 core security areas, the Symposium included ethical
considerations as an aspect in several of the areas.

Creation of an accrediting body for security programs will enhance the perception of
security programs within academia and ensure a consistently high standard within programs.
Accreditation will also give future security students a measurement by which to compare
security programs to attend. According to ASIS International (2008a), security program
accreditation would enhance prestige, and peer recognition while giving programs a marketing
advantage. Accreditation would be attractive to potential students as well as faculty. The
standardization of curriculums would validate the security program and increase recognition of the security field as a whole. However, accreditation would also have some disadvantages. Accreditation would require additional expenses and work for faculty and administrators. Additionally, accreditation criteria would very likely be imperfect, which may cause issues for administrators. Finally, accreditation requirements might restrict the ability of programs to show creativity or rapidly adjust to changing requirements of the security field. A security accrediting body might also further the progress of the security field toward professionalism because of improved transparency and increased educational standards, such as mandatory ethics studies, for involved security programs. Indeed, education does little to promote professionalism in an area unless the education is deemed rigorous and applicable to the profession.

**Program accreditation and security professionalism.** Formal schooling is the rational and systematic collection of information and the transference of that knowledge to others as formal education in a thoughtful, considered manner (Brint, 2006). Richards (2004) added that formal schooling serves as an integral part of a profession. Additionally, the development of a profession includes the predictable development of academic programs of study, research articulating the needs of the profession, and research to expand the knowledge base of the profession (Adolf, 2011). As professional standards increase, so do training lengths and associated costs (Richards, 2004, p. 42). Formal education also serves as a filter to eliminate unsuitable candidates from the profession. Thus, if security practitioners hope to solidify the perception of security as a respected profession, formal security education must be cultivated to be consistent, rigorous, and transparent. One primary way of ensuring consistency, rigor, and transparency is through a formal program-specific accreditation process.
The American Psychological Association (APA, 2010) accredits college psychology programs to ensure psychology degrees meet acceptable professional standards regarding academic rigor and content. The AACSB (2010) and ACBSP (1992) are the two primary American accrediting bodies that validate college business programs to ensure quality within business coursework. The aforementioned organizations are evidence that professionals and educators within various fields have taken an interest in regulating the quality and content of future professionals within those fields.

MBA programs are often subject to the requirements of the program-specific accrediting bodies, in which membership is often sought as evidence of the quality of a particular program. Both the AACSB and the ACBSP require some form of ethics for business program accreditation (AACSB, 2010; ACBSP, 1992). Such an accrediting body for security education would set and enforce standards, which are presumably agreed upon by stakeholders in business management, organizational security, and higher education. A college security accrediting body would ensure that security takes one step closer to professional status. Creation of a security accreditation body would likely be followed by a requirement that programs include ethics studies. Thus, creation of a security accrediting body would not only enhance security professionalism by adding consistent standards to education programs, but by forcing ethical knowledge dissemination within the profession.

**Instruction and evaluation of ethics.** Program materials and interviews indicate that ethics studies are often paired with other topic areas such as legal issues or integrated throughout other non-ethics courses. The primary topics are (1) the role of ethics in an organization and in a profession, (2) traditional ethical theory, and (3) ethical decision making. Students are evaluated by traditional written assignments and exams, but the interviewees indicated that the most
successful instruction involves case study analysis of security management ethical scenarios, discussion and explanation of ethical concepts and moral reasoning either orally or in writing.

Security management students are often evaluated by case study evaluation, traditional written assignments and exams, as well as required analysis of security management ethical scenarios, and explanation of ethical concepts either orally or in writing. Security educators favored case study, student led discussion, instructor led discussion, and written analysis assignments over multiple choice exams and lecturing. Nelson and Obremski (1990) also found student-led discussions and instructor-led discussions to be the most effective forms of ethics instruction. This also falls in line with McNair and Milam’s (1993) findings, which indicated that a majority of business faculty interviewed favored discussions and case studies, with case studies viewed as the most effective form of ethics instruction.

Blatt and Kohlberg’s (1975) examination of the effectiveness of facilitated discussion using hypothetical moral dilemmas revealed that students progressed through moral development stages through exposure to views challenging their thinking and forcing students to justify their moral thinking (Crain, 1985). Rest et al.’s schemas and Kohlberg’s stages and theory were never mentioned during the interviews in order to minimize researcher influence. However, participants consistently reinforced the aforementioned findings by describing advancements they observed in students’ understanding of moral concepts, occurring through discussions, which created challenges to their thinking and exposure to other students’ viewpoints. Even students with moral and ethical frameworks developed over decades of experience were often quoted as saying, ”I never thought of it that way.”

Interviewees’ experiences also appear to align with the neo-Kohlbergian belief that people’s perceptions of what is morally right change over time, as people adjust to their
environment. The neo-Kohlbergian approach to Kohlberg’s theory was also based off the assumption that instructors are uniquely positioned to create those environments for students through hypothetical moral dilemmas in the classroom. This was also reflected by interviewees’ comments that they had observed students adjust to teachings, and begin to make more measured security and management decisions during hypothetical scenarios.

Interviewees’ favored the use of instruction and evaluation measures that require students to evaluate a scenario, and communicate their reasoning either through writing or class discussion. This may be an indication that interviewees’ favored the methodology behind Kohlberg’s MJI tool as opposed to Rest et al.’s DIT, since the DIT allows for no explanation of moral reasoning. Indeed, some interviewees even described multiple choice style tests, such as the Likert-style questions found in the DIT, as the worst form of ethics evaluation.

Many of Kohlberg’s philosophical approaches to his theory and morality received criticism, not the least of which stemmed from Kohlberg’s focus on a Western viewpoint (Simpson, 1974), justice and rationality instead of relationships (Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983). Although not explicitly, interviewees’ comments perpetuate the above argument since they emphasized the inability to teach values, and that ethics instruction can only expose students to ethical concepts and decision making. Indeed, the same disagreement between Kohlberg and Gilligan as to what philosophical ideals represent moral elegance, is reflected by security educators’ statements pertaining to the inability to force a particular value set upon students of varied ages, cultures, and backgrounds. Thus, one might see that ethics and morals are not easily agreed upon, regardless of the audience. Such disagreement appears to be common among ethics instructors and researchers, since debate is also currently underway regarding the purpose of ethics studies in graduate business programs.
Waples et al. (2009) discussed Wynd and Mager’s (1989) argument that ethics instructors should focus on exposure to ethical issues in business while Kavathatzopoulos (1993) and Trevino (1992) emphasized uncovering managers’ moral reasoning as the purpose of ethics instruction. The results of this study seem to place security management educators in alignment with the former viewpoint, which should be no surprise, given the current emphasis on practical aspects of security in graduate Security Management programs.

Differing opinions also exist regarding which instructors should teach ethics to business students (Schuapp & Lane, 1992; Trevino & Weaver, 1994; Waples et al., 2009). Although historically, ethics professors taught ethics courses, Waples et al. (2009) suggested that the domain specific nature of business should prompt involvement from business instructors. Castro (1995) suggested that traditional ethics and philosophy instructors should be working with business instructors to teach ethics to business students. Security educators may benefit from this same approach to ethics studies.

Additional disagreement is evident in that some business ethics researchers emphasize Aristotelian virtue as the theoretical foundation for business ethics studies while other authors suggest reliance upon Kohlberg’s theory of moral development as the theoretical underpinning for business ethics instruction (Waples et al., 2009). Once security ethics education further develops, this same argument may find its way into security education research. However, the large contingent of military and law enforcement personnel represented in security may also introduce the utilitarian approach to ethics, which is sometimes a popular approach within paramilitary organizations.

Consideration of the aforementioned business ethics education arguments serves as a reminder of just how far security education is behind business education. This study may be the
first foray into the initial aspects of ethics studies in security education, which business educators faced several decades ago. Additionally, literature review reflects little to no research into security ethics education, much less any scholarly debate regarding best practices for security ethics studies. Perhaps security educators consider the security field to be a part of the developing business ethics body of work, but that seems unlikely, especially given security’s status as a field still attempting to define itself (Brooks, 2010). However, interviewees did describe some barriers to their efforts to teach ethics.

**Barriers to ethics instruction.** None of the interviewees could identify any security ethics related texts, and many instructors described other scenarios in which this lack of materials hinders ethics studies. Interviewees consistently described a lack of instructional tools and texts as a primary barrier to the instruction of ethics in security management courses, and the incorporation of ethics studies throughout a curriculum. Baker (2008; p. 170) recommended that security instructors ask four specific questions when designing or selecting a security education or training curriculum. The questions have been re-ordered for clarity of instruction. (1) “What materials currently exist that might meet our needs?” (2) “Do the materials that exist support our performance objectives?” (3) “What other organizational criteria need to be considered in the existing material?” How then can instructors and administrators hope to effectively include ethics instruction when none of the aforementioned questions can be answered due to the lack of ethics in security education materials? (4) “What is the cost of designing new materials?” Instructors and administrators may address question four from a non-monetary perspective, focusing on the time investment of creating a security ethics course, with no textbook by which to structure the course. Several interviewees mentioned that the lack of a security ethics textbook slows instructors from volunteering to teach a security ethics course, and administrators
from incorporating the course in a curriculum. Administrators may also answer question four from a financial perspective. Interviewees stated that many programs are paying instructional specialists to design courses and even curriculums. This method ensures consistent coverage of necessary objectives, and aids in meeting accreditation requirements, especially in programs that have a distance education component with large numbers of enrolled students. Instructional specialists may set higher fees to develop courses and curriculums based on non-existent education materials. This research also identified issues associated with program materials.

**The importance of program materials.** Educators provided several reasons that ethics studies may not be mentioned in the program materials, such as curriculum descriptions, course descriptions, program websites, and graduate catalogues. Administrators mentioned that other offices within the institution must approve the language used in the program materials, and those offices may focus on certain buzzwords and reject the more abstract terms, such as ethics. Additionally, those outside offices limit the amount of website or catalogue space that may be used for program materials, which forces administrators to determine which terms best describe the program. Others hypothesized that ethics is so ingrained in security, that explicit statements about ethics studies were overlooked. However, the level of emphasis on security ethics communicated in program materials typically rests on the shoulders of the program administrator, which seemingly relates to the need for administrators to recognize and emphasize ethics, in order for ethics studies to be successful within a program.

Failure to explicitly describe the presence of ethics in graduate organizational Security Management curricula may seem like a harmless detail. However, one must only consider the hidden curriculum (Kohlberg, 1980) to see potential repercussions. The inherent implication created by a lack of overt mention of ethics education may have an unintended ripple effect,
especially when coupled with a lack of a stand-alone ethics course, or clearly stated ethical goals or objectives within a program. Failure to mention ethics in program materials implies that ethics are not important enough to the study of security management to mention. It follows that, if ethics are not important to mention in the description of the study at hand, they must also be of no importance to the practice to follow. Failure to overtly mention ethics in program materials and failure to create a stand-alone ethics course positioned prominently in a curriculum description may send the implied message that ethics are not important in a particular practice. This is especially relevant considering the aforementioned research findings showing that only 31.5% of graduate Security Management programs include a mandatory stand-alone ethics course, and educators stated that ethical integration with no stand-alone course facilitates the glossing over of ethics studies in Security Management programs.

The importance of ethical knowledge and action should be more pronounced and overt then they currently are within graduate Security Management curricula and course descriptions. Indeed program materials must drive home the importance of ethics, if security students are to accept just how intertwined ethics are into every security-related decision and action. Ideally, Security Management programs should incorporate a mandatory ethics course to build a foundation of ethical concepts and theory, and to publicly display that ethics is so important to security management that the study of ethics warrants placement within a course title. Such stand-alone ethics courses should be supplemented by required integration of ethics studies into other mandatory courses.

However, several administrators stated that there are limits to what information is included in program materials, and the administrators of programs that failed to mention ethics within program materials were all able to list specific points in the program in which ethics
studies were required as part of other courses. This leads to another area of concern, with implications that reach beyond security: dependability of program materials as an accurate representation of the actual program. Many research articles have been based at least partially upon program materials as the foundation for the results (Castiglia & Nunez; 2010; Christensen et al., 2004; Sims & Sims, 1991). One might presume that program materials provide the initial portrayal of programs to potential students, hiring managers, and organizations. The reputation of a program is likely based partially upon the performance of graduates and partially upon the perception of the relevance and utility of the program to the practice and profession. One can only imagine the numerous studies in other fields, which have primarily relied upon program materials for data without using other means of triangulation or negative case analysis. These findings reinforce the importance of researchers seeking increased credibility through negative case analysis and triangulation to respectively vet or corroborate the findings from available program materials. Indeed, program materials may paint the picture for researchers, but not the entire picture.

**Summary and Recommended Research**

One might assert that ethics studies within organizational Security Management programs, which are so important to building professional status and accepted practices within a field, would be of great importance to educational researchers and security researchers. However, an initial literature review revealed no empirical research into ethics in security management or ethics studies in security management programs at any level.

The work of Kohlberg and Rest et al. was used as the backdrop for the argument that ethics *can* be taught to security management students while the common good approach to CSR was used as the backdrop for the argument the ethics *should* be taught, while asking general
questions regarding the state of ethics studies in graduate organizational security programs and the mindsets of associated educators. Using Kohlberg and Rest et al. as a lens, a literature review identified themes in the research, which related to the importance of ethics in higher education, the role of ethics and education in security management as a practice and as a profession, and security management’s evolution toward a business and management field of study.

This research included quantitative descriptive data and qualitative interviews to uncover original results, which begin to paint the picture of (1) ethics in the practice and profession of security management and (2) ethics studies within graduate Security Management programs in the U.S. This study provided a much needed model for ethics in security management, which emphasizes a balance between personal values, organizational ethics, professional ethics, international custom, applicable laws, and liability concerns as the source of ethical security management decisions, which are so important to modeling ethical behavior for organizational employees. Future research might add to this by evaluating the common ethical scenarios, which practicing security managers and security executives claim to face throughout the country.

Additionally, this research uncovered characteristics of a security management trade, which is rooted almost completely in trust, while operating in an organizational environment, which gives security managers “the keys to the kingdom,” and simultaneously exposes security employees to increased ethical tests, all under the public microscope. As a result, security managers find themselves more exposed to ethical decision making, which due to the nature of security’s enhanced authority, safety-related duties, and access to information, could result in dire consequences for ethical failure. Additional research should be conducted focused on
outlining and detailing all of the organizational factors and job responsibilities that expose security personnel to ethical decisions, and how those factors correlate.

Additionally, from a theoretical perspective, this study uncovered an unexpected link between organizational security and emergency preparedness, and an organization’s CSR. Indeed, these findings indicate that, depending upon the reasoning for creation of an organizational security department, an organization’s investment in a security department may be viewed as a reflection of an emphasis on CSR. Future Research should further examine the link between CSR and organizational security by perhaps evaluating the opinions of organizational executives regarding their reasoning for funding a security department, and those executives’ opinions on how their security departments contribute to their organizations’ CSR, if at all.

This study also showed that ethics studies in graduate security management programs are off to an adequate start, but some educators still believe security ethics studies to simply be receiving “lip service.” However, given the uncovered importance of ethics to the practice and profession of security management, ethics should arguably be one of the most consistently required areas of study. Within the classroom, although instructors use numerous methods to teach ethics, they agree with their counterparts in other fields who emphasize facilitated discussions and case studies to force exposure to other viewpoints, thereby requiring Kohlberg and Rest et al.’s cognitive conflict and social interaction, followed by articulation of moral reasoning. Thus, future studies should delve deeper into the instructional process for ethics in Security Management programs, and perhaps ascertain students’ perceptions of their own moral development as a result of ethics studies in security education. Future studies might also assess the training levels of ethics instructors, and how prepared they are to teach the courses. How do ethics instructors rate the ethical progress of students before and after their courses? How do
programs evaluate the success of ethics instruction? What measures are taken to advance ethics education as new ethical dilemmas unfold with new technologies? The connection between instructional methods, course placement, and effectiveness to practice should be considered as well.

Several barriers were also uncovered related to teaching security ethics and incorporating ethics into a curriculum. The support of the program administrator is mandatory for successful incorporation of ethics studies into a curriculum, but some program administrators argue that not enough courses exist to dedicate an entire course to ethics. Additionally, the overwhelming majority of educators interviewed described lack of security management ethics course instructional materials and textbooks as a significant hindrance to ethics instruction. Content analysis of security textbooks for evidence of ethics may help in determining not only what ethical frameworks are used as a foundation, but if ethics is discussed at all.

This study also uncovered a model depicting a need for ethics education that is reinforced by a lack of required ethical testing or required ethical action by security managers. If these findings are completely accurate, security personnel with no education may remain unexposed to any form of ethical training or education if organizations and security departments fail to include employee ethics training regularly. Further research should seek to uncover how and if ethics training are integrated for security practitioners at all levels within the workplace. Although the aforementioned research findings open the door for future research, they also provide some immediate benefits.

**Benefits of the study.** Possibly the key benefit of this research is that it established the aforementioned characteristics of security management and security management education by using a rigorous research methodology. Regardless of the findings, this research will add to the
body of work, which educators found to be so lacking in security. This research will, at a minimum, help security make one step, albeit modest, toward security professionalism by adding to general security research, and security ethics research.

This research adds to, and potentially initiates the empirical body of work related to ethics in organizational Security Management education, and educators’ and practitioners’ perceptions of the role of ethics to the study, the practice, and the professional progress of security management. The resulting model for ethical decision making in security management may be a foundation for future ethics research.

The study also provides some insight for security professional bodies into whether graduate organizational Security Management programs are attempting to provide potential members with the requisite knowledge to understand and abide by their required codes of ethics (ASIS International, 2011). Additionally, any attempts to create a security academic accreditation body, which will likely include ethical studies requirements, will now have a basic picture of the layout of ethics studies in graduate Security Management programs, and the attitudes of educators regarding ethics studies.

Security educators may also benefit from the knowledge that they are the only form of ethical knowledge dissemination for security personnel, which may prompt re-evaluation by administrators and instructors of the prominence and emphasis they place up ethics as an area of study within their programs. The final results may also help administrators identify shortcomings in the academic preparation of security managers in meeting the ethical requirements of the published standards for security executives (ASIS International, 2010a; Security Executive Council, 2011). In addition, security students may benefit from the
opportunity to make a more informed decision regarding which program to attend in order to emphasize ethics in security management.

Organizations hiring and employing security managers, who have arguably the most indirect influence over decisions made regarding program content, may also benefit from enhanced understanding regarding the state of ethics education provided to employees with graduate degrees in organizational Security Management. The results of this research may help organizations better prepare to evaluate the organizational Security Management graduate degree of a security manager or potential security manager. This seems especially salient as it relates to ethics studies, given the consequences of unethical security management practices, which may cause security breaches, failed crisis responses, or data access abuse resulting in danger, loss of profit, negative publicity, and potential civil liability for an organization.

Conclusion

Few trades, professions, or industries pair such a consistent dependence upon ethics and trust with such drastic consequences for ethical failure, yet the security management field is often embedded within the cost versus benefit corporate culture. Thus, it should be no surprise that emphasis on practical aspects of security management hold sway, and overshadow the theoretical or conceptual aspects of security research and education. Indeed, security finds itself disjointed and underdeveloped as an area of academic research, and research into ethics in security management appears to be borderline nonexistent.

This research has shown that security practitioners, educators, and researchers acknowledge security’s heightened reliance upon ethics as a profession and a practice. Although graduate Security Management programs in the U.S. are indeed incorporating ethics education into curricula, the integration can best be described as a minor undercurrent or simply a box to
check. Security management researchers must reverse course from a focus on the practical aspects of security to build on the findings herein on ethics in security management.

Additionally, educators must enforce a prominent and deliberate focus on ethics in security management education if students are to be expected to acknowledge the importance of ethical decision making in security management. Given the findings that security education serves as the only form of ethical knowledge transmittal in security, failure to prioritize and highlight ethics studies could result in the tacit minimization of the role and importance of ethics to security management students and practitioners, thereby having significant negative consequences to practitioners’ ability to perform daily operations, and any attempts to professionalize the field of security management.
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Appendix A

Phone Recruitment Script

Sir/Ma’am,

My name is Dan Adolf. I am a CPP, a security management instructor, a fellow security professional, and a student in need of assistance with my dissertation in the Northeastern University Doctorate of Education program. Do you mind speaking to me for a few minutes?

I am working on my dissertation, which is on ethics studies within security management graduate programs in the U.S. I am contacting you because I saw that you are a security management instructor/administrator, and I was hoping you might consider allowing me to interview you via telephone sometime in the next couple weeks. I estimate that the interview will take no longer than one hour. The interview will be recorded and transcribed, but I will sanitize the transcription of any language that identifies you. Once I have transcribed the interview, I will email the transcription to you for verification that the transcription is accurate. Additionally, once the recording is transcribed and analyzed, the recording will be deleted. Finally, you will also be invited to log on to a password protected online wiki to post comments regarding the final theoretical model I have created. Does this seem like something you would be willing to help me out with?

If the answer is “no”: I understand, and I very much appreciate your time. Have a great day.

If the answer is “yes”: I really appreciate your help! The next step is for me to send you an informed consent form, and we can discuss any questions you have about the form and your participation. But first, do you have any questions for me about what I will be asking of you?
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form
Ethics Studies in Graduate Organizational Security Management Programs in America

Thank you for considering participating in my Doctoral Thesis at Northeastern University. I will be asking you to provide information through interviews and possibly by providing other information.

Please consider the following:

- Your participation is voluntary, you may refuse to answer any question, and you can end your involvement at any time.
- You will not be compensated for your participation and there will be no direct benefits to you for participating in the research.
- However, your participation may help increase understanding of security management education.
- Participation will cause no foreseeable risks to you.
- Every reasonable measure will be taken to ensure confidentiality, including sanitization of text for any items that might identify you, your institution, or any other individual. In addition, neither your supervisor nor your institution will be informed of your responses.
- Some of your comments may be published within academic journals. However, if published, the comments will be sanitized of any identifying information that may infer or directly reveal your identity.
- Your interview will be recorded and transcribed. You will be provided with a transcript of your interview in order to (1) give you the opportunity to remove any of your comments from consideration and (2) provide you with the opportunity to ensure an accurate transcription.
- The recordings will be deleted after transcription and analysis are complete.

What will I be asking of you?

I am asking your permission to interview you regarding your opinions on ethics in security management, and ethics studies in security management education. The interview is intended to last approximately 60 minutes. I may also ask for a recommendation and contact information for another security management instructor or program administrator within your program, who you think would be a good interview candidate.

Additionally, as part of my attempt to ensure validity of my research, I will email you a copy of the interview transcript for your review and approval. Finally, you will also be invited to log on to a password protected online wiki to post comments regarding the final theoretical model I have created. I will work very hard to minimize the time you spend working with me.

Please feel free to contact me any time with any questions you may have. I can be reached at: adolf.d@husky.neu.edu or ###-###-####. You can also contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Joseph McNabb at j.mcnabb@neu.edu.
Any questions related to your rights in this research can be answered by Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, 617-373-4588, Email: irb@neu.edu. Your anonymity will be maintained if you request it.

I will also review this form again prior to our interview, and you will be provided another opportunity immediately prior to the interview to have any questions answered.

Please keep this form for your records.
Appendix C: Interview Script

Sir/Ma’am,

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. Before we get started I want to verify that you received the electronic copy of the informed consent form, which I sent to you previously. Yes/No.

Did you have any questions about the informed consent form, or anything else that I can answer before we get started?

I just want to verify that you are aware that I am recording your voice, and that you are voluntarily submitting to this phone interview.

I will be asking a series of questions related to security management, ethics, and education. Please feel free to elaborate as much or as little as you feel necessary, and know that you can refuse to answer any question, or ask for clarification at any time. I will consistently paraphrase your replies in an effort to ensure that I understand you.

Ethics included/not included in Program Materials

Administrator (Non-Ethics) Administrator (Ethics) Instructor (Non-Ethics)
Instructor (Ethics)

How do you describe your definition of ethics in security management?

What role do ethics play, if any, in the perception of security managers as professionals?

How are ethics necessary, if so, for Security Managers to conduct the day-to-day practice of security management?
What role does education play, if any, in the perception of security managers as professionals?

How is education necessary, if so, for Security Managers to conduct the day-to-day practice of security management?

What role do ethics studies play, if any, in graduate security management studies?

Some interviewees have suggested that the purpose of ethics studies should be to simply expose students to potential ethical decision making in hopes that students will later apply ethics to security management decisions. Others have suggested that we should be teaching write from wrong and what is ethically correct. Do you have an opinion on either of these?

Some interviewees have suggested that Organizational Security and Emergency Preparedness may actually be a facet of business ethics or Corporate Social Responsibility because of security/EM’s role in keeping people free from harm. Do you have an opinion on this?

What characteristics, if any, within your program prepare students to take and pass the Board Certification exam in Security Management?

Describe the instruction and evaluation methods for ethics studies within your program.

Of those instruction and evaluation methods, which have you thought to be most effective and least effective? Why?

How would you describe the progress, if any, that you have seen students make in their moral reasoning as they progress through ethics an ethics course program incorporating ethics?
Please describe difficulties in teaching ethics and barriers to incorporating ethics into a curriculum.

I see that your program and course descriptions do not mention ethics. How was the decision reached to exclude the mention of ethics studies from your program and course descriptions?

Why do you agree or disagree with the decision to exclude ethics studies from your program description and course descriptions?

What is your opinion of the current tools for security ethics instruction such as textbooks?

Any negative effects on ethics instruction or course development because of the lack of materials?
Follow Up Wiki Email Script

Greetings again! You may remember that you previously assisted me by participating in a phone interview for my Doctoral Thesis at Northeastern University on ethics studies within graduate security management programs. I am emailing to follow up and thank you again because your willingness to help is one of the primary reasons why I am nearing the end of my thesis. As I am sure you are aware, I literally could not have done it without your help.

I also want to ask your assistance one last time by inviting you to comment on some of my final visual models, which I have created partially from my interpretation of your insights, as well as the insights of others like you.

You should have received an automated email with logon instructions for the wiki I created. If you did not get it, please check your spam. The wiki will be open from Saturday, May 5th, 2012 to Friday, May 11th, 2012. There is no need to log on at a particular time, since your comments will remain on the wiki throughout the duration. Please feel free to email me or call me with any questions you have related to the wiki or logging on. Once you log in and view the models, you can select the discussion post icon, which is immediately right of the “Edit” button at the top of the screen. The discussion post icon does not say “discussion post,” but it is identified by two word bubbles. Clicking the discussion post icon should provide you the ability to provide an anonymous comment on the wiki in the form of a discussion post (similar to an online course). Please feel free to provide any insight, advice, or comments. You can also email me or call me using the below listed contact information.

Again, I thank you very much for your participation.

Dan Adolf

Adolf.d@husky.neu.edu

###-###-####
## Appendix D: Codes and Categories Identified During Open Coding

### Category: Security Management Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad SM Ed Helps Students Recognize Fundamental Principles, and Practices, and Important Issues in the Profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Education Still More Applied Area of Study and Less Theoretical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Ed Exposes Students to International Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ratios of Prior LE and Mil Causes Special Needs in Sec Ed - Public Affairs - Less Authority - Balancing Org Goals -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Ed Exposes Students to Security Decisions and Repercussions that Prior Mil and LE Did Not Previously Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Sec Ed Exposes Students to Strategic Sec Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Too Broadly Focused and Academic or Theory Oriented to Focus on Prof Cert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education is a Foundation, but Must Be Balanced with Experience and Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Domains Used as Foundation for Grad Sec Mgt Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Mgt Programs Designed Around Sec Mgt Fundamentals, Which Happen to Fall in Line with CPP Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt Education Teaches Students How to Evaluate and Adapt to Employing Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Viewed as Industry Standard, Which Makes it a Valid Framework for a Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Domains Used as Part of the Framework for Security Mgt Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Education Prepares Students for Security Specific Mgt Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt MORE in Need of Grad Ed than other Mgrs Because we are More Narrowly Focused or Closed Minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Students Not Automatically Multidisciplinary--They Need to Be Forced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate SM Ed Intended Provide Ability to Think Critically and Communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies Used to Evaluate all Facets of Security Mgt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Don't Intend Programs to Prepare Students for Certifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management and Decision Making Practices Can Be Taught in the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Practices Can Be Taught in the Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Related to Project Management as a Field of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Crisis Planning Related to Strategic Planning as an Academic Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of Importance of Org Sec and EP Mgr Allows for Development of Quality Education Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of Importance of Sec or EP Manager Highlighting Importance of Sec or EP Training and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Without Practical Experience in Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with Practical Knowledge but Without Program Administration Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Integrated Throughout Entire School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Lacking Ethics Studies are Lacking Fundamentally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Not Included in Every Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Applied to Security or Emergency Mgt or Bus Cont or Risk Mgt Aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Addressed in Intro Security Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Related to Security Planning or Emergency Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethics Studies More Overt in Public Sector Courses
Ethics Studies Cannot Be Standardized Due to Cultural and Organizational Differences
Ethics Education Results in Consideration of Scenarios from a Different Perspective
Ethics Studies as Important to Sec Mgt Education as Any Other Area Because Every Security Action is Ethically Oriented
Ethics Integrated In Security Administration Courses
Ethics Studies Sometimes Not Taken Seriously as Academic Topic
Ethics Given Lip Service, But Not Really Emphasized
Ethics Integrated Throughout Program
Security Educators Expected to Model Ethical Actions
Ethics Not Mentioned in Program Materials Because Other Topics Deemed More Important In Program Materials
Ethics Not Mentioned in Program Material Because it is Not the Primary Focus of the Course
Need for Multimedia Educational Tools for Sec Mgt Ethics Studies
Sec Mgt Ethics Taught Using General Ethics, CJ Ethics, or Mgt Ethics Instructional Tools
Lack of Sec Mgt Ethics Instructional Tools--Leading to Fewer Sec Mgt Ethics Courses and Less Ethical Emphasis
Courses Designed by Instructional Technologist Who Create Courses Based off Textbooks
Ethics Courses Not Prominent Because No Ethics Textbooks Available
Use of Non-Security Ethics Texts Limits Students' Exposure to Necessary Security Specific Ethical Scenarios
Lack of Text Causes Issue Because Many Security Ethics Instructors Lack Sec Experience So They Cannot Provide Sec Ethics Scenarios
Current Tools for CJ and Business Ethics Instruction Good Enough--No Sec Mgt Ethics Text Necessary
Current Tools for CJ and Business Ethics Instruction are Not Appropriate for SM Ed
Case Studies Used to Teach or Evaluate Ethical Knowledge to Sec Mgt Students
Ethics Studies Through Student or Instructor Facilitated Discussions
ENGAGEMENT Mandatory for Ethics Instruction
Lecturing Seen as Least Effective Form of Ethics Instruction
Lecturing Seen as Least Effective Form of Instruction for Graduate Learners
Multiple Choice Tests-Worst Form of Evaluation of Ethics Comprehension
Oral Evaluations or Graded Discussions-Best Form of Ethical Knowledge Evaluation
Support of Program Head is Mandatory for Ethics to be Effectively Taught in any Sec Mgt Grad Program
Ethics Studies Taught Using Case Studies, Discussions, Papers, and Teamwork Assignments
Ethical Knowledge Evaluated Using Tests and Written Assignments
Most Effective Form of Ethics Instruction Varied by Class-Dependent on Which Method Best ENGAGES Students
Best Form of Ethics Studies Evaluation is Whichever Requires Students to Articulate or Explain Concepts and Reasoning
Evaluation of Ethical Knowledge in Classroom Does Not Mean Ethical Action
Ethics Studies Taught Using Discussions, Written Assignments, and Case Studies
Articulation and Explanation of Moral Reasoning Viewed as Only Way to Determine if Student Understands Ethical Concepts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussions Seen as Best Ethics Teaching Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Asked to Write a Code of Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies Seen as the Best Form of Ethics Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGING Students is Biggest Barrier to Teaching Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in Teaching Ethics is Varied Values of Students Due to Cultural Differences Affecting Value Norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier to Teaching Ethics is Students Having No Emphasis on Any Kind of Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Administrators Do Not Believe Ethics Should be in a Stand Alone Course—Just Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on Only Integration Results in Brush Stroke Ethics Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Instructors Should Take Care Not To Inject Their Values in Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Personal Value Injection Can Even Occur Through Assignment Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enough Courses in the Curriculum For Stand Alone Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Included But Not Heavily Emphasized Because Grad Students Have Pre-Formed Frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios Addressed in Class Without Mention of Ethics, But Students Expected to Incorporate Them Into Their Reasonings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Intended to Raise Ethical Awareness, and Expose Students to Ethical Decisions in a Safe Learning Environment, Not Say What is Ethically Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt Ethics Education Teaches Students to Evaluate the Employing Organization's Ethical Stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Results in the Ability to Understand Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Enhance Ethical Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Not Intended to Change Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Intended to Prepare Students to Uphold Professional Code of Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Teaches Students About Potential Consequences of Unethical Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Give Students the Opportunity to Face Sec Mgt Ethics Decisions in a Safe Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if Taught Successfully, Students Still Have to Actively Accept What is Being Taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Historical Foundation for Ethical Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces Exposure to Other Moral Reasoning Via Students and Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Provides a Dissemination Tool to Ensure That Ethics are Passed On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Important Because Large Proportion of Sec Grad Students Come From Other Disciplines, So They are Unfamiliar with Security Ethics Scenarios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category: Ethics in Security Management**

Recent Increase in Organizational Awareness of the Need for Organizational Ethics
Public Sector Workers More Aware of Ethical Issues than Private Sector Workers
For Profit Organizations See Ethics as Secondary to Profit or Survival
Sec Managers' Roles in CSR Vary From Organization to Organization
CSR has Become More Important in Last Decade
CSR and Ethics Includes Sourcing Material
Ethics and CSR Varied Culturally and Internationally
Existence of and Investment in Security Management is a Reflection of an Organization's CSR or Business Ethics


| Security's Enhanced Exposure to People Inside and Outside the Organization--Represent Organization |
| Primary Ethical Concern of Sec Mgrs is Ethics of Security Officers Under Them |
| Ethics Higher Among Security Than Among LE |
| Ethics Increased in Security Since 9-11 |
| Importance of Recurrent Ethics Training for Sec Officers and Mgrs in the Workplace |
| Ethics Must Be Emphasized from the Top Down in an Organization-Otherwise Unethical Trickle Down Affect |
| Sec Mgt and EM Not Considered a Reflection of CSR and Bus Ethics Because Grounded in Self Preservation |
| Def of Ethics in Sec Mgt-Making Sec Mgt Decisions in an Unbiased, Unprejudiced, and Ethically Grounded Way |
| Def of Ethics in Sec Mgt-Making Sec Mgt Decisions While Balancing Personal Values, Organizational Ethics, Professional Codes, and Societal Moral Norms |
| Def of Ethics-Following Ethical Standards of the Profession |
| Def - Ethics in Sec Mgt is Doing What is Right Within Sec Mgt Decisions |
| Applying Societal Normative Values to SM Situations |
| Applying and Modeling Ethics From the Corporate Level to Mgt Level Based on Organizational Ethics |
| Ethics Important to All Managers |
| Ethics Key to Contemporary Management |
| Ethics Heavily Considered During Security or Continuity Plan Development |
| Common Expectation that Creation of Security or Continuity Plans Involves Ethics |
| Response Situations Can Cause People to Disregard Ethics |
| Changing Priorities During Crisis or Security Incident Causing Shift in Ethical Priorities |
| Planned Response Actions Reflect High Morals But Actual Incidents Can Reduce Moral Decision Making |
| Poor Decision Making and Poor Leadership During Crisis Events |
| Ethical Decision Making Continuum—Ethical Standards Decrease By Necessity of Events |
| Ethics Paramount to Sec Managers and Sec Executives |
| Ethical Knowledge More Important to Sec Mgrs than Other Mgrs Because of Consequences-Protection of Life |
| Ethics More Important to Sec Mgrs Because of Numerous Sec Roles and Numerous Management Roles in an Organization |
| Ethics Not Lacking in Security, But There is a Perception That It Is |
| Security Managers and Officers Have More Contact with the Public and Org Workers than Others |
| Security Management Sometimes Serve as the Organization's Ethics Entity |
| Ethics is Foundation of ALL Security Functions and Tasks Because of Trust Required |
| Ethics More Important to Sec Mgrs Because of Access to Information |
| Ethics More Important to Security Managers Because of Asset Protection |
| Sec Mgrs Maintaining Integrity in Human Capital |
| Trust Required for Security Functions Makes Ethics Among Sec Mgrs Key to Career Survival |
| Ethical Failures in Sec Mgt Negatively Affects Public's Perception of the Organization Partially Because of Security's Exposure |
## Success Depends on Reputation of Security—Loss of Which Could Occur Through Ethical Error

- Sec Mgt Serves as Ethical Example in an Organization
- Security More Likely to Come in Contact with Ethical Dilemmas
- As a Security Mgt, You Have the Keys to the Kingdom
- SM Supervise Culturally Diverse Security Team with Varied Values
- SM Often Exposed to International Situations Where Faced with Ethical Dilemmas Because of Differing Intl Values
- Ethics Important Because SM Conduct Internal Investigations
- Security Mgrs Put in Position to Balance Personal Values Professional Values and Org Ethics
- Sec Mgrs Less Restricted by Laws and Regulations Than Law Enforcement
- Sec Mgrs Lose Reputation and Credibility Among Org Workers and Effectiveness in Org During Ethical Breach
- Security Breaches or Incidents Occurring as a Result of Sec Ethics Violations Equate to Negative Publicity for the Organization
- Security Ethics Violations Can Result in Civil Liability for the Organization
- Sec Mgrs Hire, Train, and Evaluate Ethics of Subordinate Security Personnel
- Sec Mgt Faced with Bribery While Travelling Internationally
- SM Not Considered a Reflection of Ethics or CSR Because You Can Be Unethical While Still Wanting to Protect People
- The More Responsible the Sec Position, the Higher the Perceived Ethics
- The More Responsible The Sec Position, the Greater the Need for Ethics

## Post 9-11 Recognition of Importance of Org Sec and EP Promoted Professionalization

- Education Necessary for Professionalism
- Security Managers Seeking Professionalism to be Marketable Beyond Their Current Job to Future Positions
- Recent Crisis Highlight Importance of Security and EM Mgrs and Reinforce Need for Professionalism Among Them
- Ethics and Education as Pillars of Professionalism
- Sec Mgt Not Considered a Profession
- Security's Increased Contact with Public Means They Must Work Harder to Show Professionalism (Nodes)
- Ethical Standards Necessary for Professionalism
- Security Management Seen More as a Profession Now than Previously
- Ethical Failures in Security Reflect Negatively on Security as a Profession
- Security Represents the Entire Organization
- Actions of a Single Sec Mgr Represent the Entire Profession
- Lack of Professional Status Because No Formal Mandatory Testing and Standards
- Lack of Required Professional Certification or License Leaves Education as Only Consistent Form of Ethics Knowledge Dissemination in SM Ed
- Lack of Professionalism Because No Formal Required Ethics Body With Revocation Authority
- Body of Knowledge and Education Programs Necessary for Professionalism
- Security Body of Knowledge Has Made Progress But Not Good Enough Yet for Professional Status
- Education, Body of Knowledge, Code of Conduct, and System of Enforcement ALL Necessary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>for Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security or Continuity Managers Operate Based off Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security or Continuity Managers Selected from Current Managers with No Security or Continuity Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Events Promoting Awareness of Importance of Security and EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of Importance of Organizational Security and EP Highlighting Importance of Role of Sec or EP Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs often Chosen from HR because HR people are not as closed off as Sec People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Decisions Affect Public Perception of the Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Breaches or Errors Result in Negative Publicity and Civil Liability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Category: Security Management Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad SM Ed Helps Students</td>
<td>Recognize Fundamental Principles, and Practices, and Important Issues in the Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Education Still More</td>
<td>Applied Area of Study and Less Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Ed Exposes Students</td>
<td>to International Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ratios of Prior LE and</td>
<td>Mil Causes Special Needs in Sec Ed - Public Affairs - Less Authority - Balancing Org Goals -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Ed Exposes Students to</td>
<td>Security Decisions and Repercussions that Prior Mil and LE Did Not Previously Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Sec Ed Exposes</td>
<td>Students to Strategic Sec Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Too Broadly Focused</td>
<td>and Academic or Theory Oriented to Focus on Prof Cert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education is a Foundation,</td>
<td>but Must Be Balanced with Experience and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Domains Used as</td>
<td>Foundation for Grad Sec Mgt Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Mgt Programs</td>
<td>Designed Around Sec Mgt Fundamentals, Which Happen to Fall in Line with CPP Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt Education</td>
<td>Teaches Students How to Evaluate and Adapt to Employing Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Viewed as Industry</td>
<td>Standard, Which Makes it a Valid Framework for a Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP Domains Used as</td>
<td>Part of the Framework for Security Mgt Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Education Prepares</td>
<td>Students for Security Specific Mgt Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt MORE in Need of</td>
<td>Grad Ed than other Mgrs Because we are More Narrowly Focused or Closed Minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Sec Students Not</td>
<td>Automatically Multidisciplinary--They Need to Be Forced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate SM Ed Intended</td>
<td>Provide Ability to Think Critically and Communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies Used to</td>
<td>Evaluate all Facets of Security Mgt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Don't</td>
<td>Intend Programs to Prepare Students for Certifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management and</td>
<td>Decision Making Practices Can Be Taught in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Practices</td>
<td>Can Be Taught in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Related</td>
<td>to Project Management as a Field of Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and Crisis Planning</td>
<td>Related to Strategic Planning as an Academic Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of</td>
<td>Importance of Org Sec and EP Mgr Allows for Development of Quality Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of</td>
<td>Importance of Sec or EP Manager Highlighting Importance of Sec or EP Training and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators Without</td>
<td>Practical Experience in Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty with Practical</td>
<td>Knowledge but Without Program Administration Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category: Ethics Studies in Security Management Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Integrated Throughout</td>
<td>Entire School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Lacking Ethics Studies</td>
<td>are Lacking Fundamentally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Not Included in Every</td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Applied to</td>
<td>Security or Emergency Mgt or Bus Cont or Risk Mgt Aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Addressed in Intro Security Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Related to Security Planning or Emergency Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies More Overt in Public Sector Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Cannot Be Standardized Due to Cultural and Organizational Differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Education Results in Consideration of Scenarios from a Different Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies as Important to Sec Mgt Education as Any Other Area Because Every Security Action is Ethically Oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Integrated In Security Administration Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Sometimes Not Taken Seriously as Academic Topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Given Lip Service, But Not Really Emphasized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Integrated Throughout Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Educators Expected to Model Ethical Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Studies Important Because Large Proportion of Sec Grad Students Come From Other Disciplines, So They are Unfamiliar with Security Ethics Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Category: Program Materials

| Ethics Not Mentioned in Program Materials Because Other Topics Deemed More Important In Program Materials |
| Ethics Not Mentioned in Program Material Because it is Not the Primary Focus of the Course |

Sub-Category: Textbooks and Learning Materials

| Need for Multimedia Educational Tools for Sec Mgt Ethics Studies |
| Sec Mgt Ethics Taught Using General Ethics, CJ Ethics, or Mgt Ethics Instructional Tools |
| Lack of Sec Mgt Ethics Instructional Tools--Leading to Fewer Sec Mgt Ethics Courses and Less Ethical Emphasis |
| Courses Designed by Instructional Technologist Who Create Courses Based off Textbooks |
| Ethics Courses Not Prominent Because No Ethics Textbooks Available |
| Use of Non-Security Ethics Texts Limits Students' Exposure to Necessary Security Specific Ethical Scenarios |
| Lack of Text Causes Issue Because Many Security Ethics Instructors Lack Sec Experience So They Cannot Provide Sec Ethics Scenarios |
| Current Tools for CJ and Business Ethics Instruction Good Enough--No Sec Mgt Ethics Text Necessary |
| Current Tools for CJ and Business Ethics Instruction are Not Appropriate for SM Ed |

Sub-Category: Teaching and Evaluation Methods

| Need for Case Studies Used to Teach or Evaluate Ethical Knowledge to Sec Mgt Students |
| Ethics Studies Through Student or Instructor Facilitated Discussions |
| ENGAGEMENT Mandatory for Ethics Instruction |
| Lecturing Seen as Least Effective Form of Ethics Instruction |
| Lecturing Seen as Least Effective Form of Instruction for Graduate Learners |
| Multiple Choice Tests-Worst Form of Evaluation of Ethics Comprehension |
| Oral Evaluations or Graded Discussions-Best Form of Ethical Knowledge Evaluation |
| Support of Program Head is Mandatory for Ethics to be Effectively Taught in any Sec Mgt Grad Program |
Ethics Studies Taught Using Case Studies, Discussions, Papers, and Teamwork Assignments
Ethical Knowledge Evaluated Using Tests and Written Assignments
Most Effective Form of Ethics Instruction Varied by Class-Dependent on Which Method Best ENGAGES Students
Best Form of Ethics Studies Evaluation is Whichever Requires Students to Articulate or Explain Concepts and Reasoning
Evaluation of Ethical Knowledge in Classroom Does Not Mean Ethical Action
Ethics Studies Taught Using Discussions, Written Assignments, and Case Studies
Articulation and Explanation of Moral Reasoning Viewed as Only Way to Determine if Student Understands Ethical Concepts
Discussions Seen as Best Ethics Teaching Method
Students Asked to Write a Code of Ethics
Case Studies Seen as the Best Form of Ethics Studies
Sub-Category: Barriers to Teaching Ethics or Incorporating Ethics in a Curriculum
ENGAGING Students is Biggest Barrier to Teaching Ethics
Difficulty in Teaching Ethics is Varied Values of Students Due to Cultural Differences Affecting Value Norms
Barrier to Teaching Ethics is Students Having No Emphasis on Any Kind of Values
Some Administrators Do Not Believe Ethics Should be in a Stand Alone Course-Just Integrated
Reliance on Only Integration Results in Brush Stroke Ethics Education
Ethics Instructors Should Take Care Not To Inject Their Values in Courses
Instructor Personal Value Injection Can Even Occur Through Assignment Selection
Not Enough Courses in the Curriculum For Stand Alone Course
Sub-Category: Roles and Expectations of Ethics Studies
Ethics Studies Included But Not Heavily Emphasized Because Grad Students Have Pre-Formed Frameworks
Scenarios Addressed in Class Without Mention of Ethics, But Students Expected to Incorporate Them Into Their Reasonings
Ethics Education Intended to Raise Ethical Awareness, and Expose Students to Ethical Decisions in a Safe Learning Environment, Not Say What is Ethically Right
Sec Mgt Ethics Education Teaches Students to Evaluate the Employing Organization's Ethical Stance
Education Results in the Ability to Understand Ethical Frameworks and Decision Making
Ethics Education Not Intended to Change Values
Ethics Education Intended to Prepare Students to Uphold Professional Code of Ethics
Ethics Education Teaches Students About Potential Consequences of Unethical Acts
Ethics Studies Give Students the Opportunity to Face Sec Mgt Ethics Decisions in a Safe Environment
Even if Taught Successfully, Students Still Have to Actively Accept What is Being Taught
Provides Historical Foundation for Ethical Decisions
Forces Exposure to Other Moral Reasoning Via Students and Instructor
Ethics Education Provides a Dissemination Tool to Ensure That Ethics are Passed On
**Category: Ethics in Security Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recent Increase in Organizational Awareness of the Need for Organizational Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Workers More Aware of Ethical Issues than Private Sector Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Profit Organizations See Ethics as Secondary to Profit or Survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Managers' Roles in CSR Vary From Organization to Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR has Become More Important in Last Decade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR and Ethics Includes Sourcing Material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and CSR Varied Culturally and Internationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of and Investment in Security Management is a Reflection of an Organization's CSR or Business Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security's Enhanced Exposure to People Inside and Outside the Organization--Represent Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Ethical Concern of Sec Mgrs is Ethics of Security Officers Under Them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Higher Among Security Than Among LE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Increased in Security Since 9-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Recurrent Ethics Training for Sec Officers and Mgrs in the Workplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Must Be Emphasized from the Top Down in an Organization-Otherwise Unethical Trickle Down Affect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt and EM Not Considered a Reflection of CSR and Bus Ethics Because Grounded in Self Preservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgrs Hire, Train, and Evaluate Ethics of Subordinate Security Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt Faced with Bribery While Travelling Internationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Not Considered a Reflection of Ethics or CSR Because You Can Be Unethical While Still Wanting to Protect People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The More Responsible the Sec Position, the Higher the Perceived Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The More Responsible The Sec Position, the Greater the Need for Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Category: Definitions of Ethics in Security Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def of Ethics in Sec Mgt-Making Sec Mgt Decisions in an Unbiased, Unprejudiced, and Ethically Grounded Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def - Ethics in Sec Mgt is Doing What is Right Within Sec Mgt Decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Societal Normative Values to SM Situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying and Modeling Ethics From the Corporate Level to Mgt Level Based on Organizational Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Category: Importance of Ethics to Security Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Important to All Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Key to Contemporary Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Heavily Considered During Security or Continuity Plan Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Expectation that Creation of Security or Continuity Plans Involves Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Situations Can Cause People to Disregard Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Priorities During Crisis or Security Incident Causing Shift in Ethical Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Response Actions Reflect High Morals But Actual Incidents Can Reduce Moral Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Decision Making and Poor Leadership During Crisis Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Decision Making Continuum—Ethical Standards Decrease By Necessity of Events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Paramount to Sec Managers and Sec Executives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Knowledge More Important to Sec Mgrs than Other Mgrs Because of Consequences—Protection of Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics More Important to Sec Mgrs Because of Numerous Sec Roles and Numerous Management Roles in an Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Not Lacking in Security, But There is a Perception That It Is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Managers and Officers Have More Contact with the Public and Org Workers than Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management Sometimes Serve as the Organization's Ethics Entity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics is Foundation of ALL Security Functions and Tasks Because of Trust Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics More Important to Sec Mgrs Because of Access to Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics More Important to Security Managers Because of Asset Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgrs Maintaining Integrity in Human Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Required for Security Functions Makes Ethics Among Sec Mgrs Key to Career Survival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Failures in Sec Mgt Negatively Affects Public's Perception of the Organization Partially Because of Security's Exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Depends on Reputation of Security-Loss of Which Could Occur Through Ethical Error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgt Serves as Ethical Example in an Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security More Likely to Come in Contact with Ethical Dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a Security Mgt, You Have the Keys to the Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Supervise Culturally Diverse Security Team with Varied Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Often Exposed to International Situations Where Faced with Ethical Dilemmas Because of Differing Intl Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Important Because SM Conduct Internal Investigations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Mgrs Put in Position to Balance Personal Values Professional Values and Org Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgrs Less Restricted by Laws and Regulations Than Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec Mgrs Lose Reputation and Credibility Among Org Workers and Effectiveness in Org During Ethical Breach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Breaches or Incidents Occurring as a Result of Sec Ethics Violations Equate to Negative Publicity for the Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Ethics Violations Can Result in Civil Liability for the Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category: Security Management Professionalism**

<p>| Post 9-11 Recognition of Importance of Org Sec and EP Promoted Professionalization |
| Education Necessary for Professionalism |
| Security Managers Seeking Professionalism to be Marketable Beyond Their Current Job to Future Positions |
| Recent Crisis Highlight Importance of Security and EM Mgrs and Reinforce Need for Professionalism Among Them |
| Ethics and Education as Pillars of Professionalism |
| See Mgt Not Considered a Profession |
| Security's Increased Contact with Public Means They Must Work Harder to Show |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Standards Necessary for Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management Seen More as a Profession Now than Previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Failures in Security Reflect Negatively on Security as a Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Represents the Entire Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions of a Single Sec Mgr Represent the Entire Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Professional Status Because No Formal Mandatory Testing and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Required Professional Certification or License Leaves Education as Only Consistent Form of Ethics Knowledge Dissemination in SM Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Professionalism Because No Formal Required Ethics Body With Revocation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body of Knowledge and Education Programs Necessary for Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Body of Knowledge Has Made Progress But Not Good Enough Yet for Professional Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Body of Knowledge, Code of Conduct, and System of Enforcement ALL Necessary for Professionalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: General Security Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security or Continuity Managers Operate Based off Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security or Continuity Managers Selected from Current Managers with No Security or Continuity Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Events Promoting Awareness of Importance of Security and EP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Recognition of Importance of Organizational Security and EP Highlighting Importance of Role of Sec or EP Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs often Chosen from HR because HR people are not as closed off as Sec People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Decisions Affect Public Perception of the Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Breaches or Errors Result in Negative Publicity and Civil Liability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F: Domains and Tasks Tested in the CPP Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Domain Evaluated</th>
<th>Exam Content Percentage</th>
<th>Security Tasks Included in the Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Security principles and practices | 19% | - Security planning  
- Threat and vulnerability analysis  
- Loss prevention  
- Security auditing  
- Public law enforcement liaisons  
- Development and presentation of security awareness programs for organizational personnel |
| Business principles and practices | 11% | - Budgeting, financial control, and fiscal responsibility  
- Development of policies and procedures to achieve organizational goals  
- Development of procedures to measure and meet organizational objectives  
- Develop, implement, and maintain staffing, leadership, and training programs  
- Monitor and ensure a sound ethical climate in accordance with the laws and the organization’s directives and standards |
| Legal aspects | 7% | - Develop and maintain security policies, procedures and practices which comply with relevant elements of criminal, civil, administrative and regulatory law to minimize adverse legal consequences  
- Provide coordination, assistance, and evidence such as documentation and testimony to support legal counsel in actual or potential criminal and/or civil proceedings |
- Provide advice and assistance to management and others in developing performance requirements and contractual terms for security vendors/suppliers and establish effective monitoring processes to ensure that organizational needs and contractual requirements are being met.

- Provide assistance to management, legal counsel and human resources in developing strategic and tactical plans for responding to labor disputes, including strikes.

- Develop and maintain security policies, procedures, and practices that comply with relevant laws regarding investigations.

- Develop and maintain security policies, procedures, and practices that comply with relevant laws regarding personnel security.

- Develop and maintain security policies, procedures, and practices that comply with relevant laws regarding information security.

| Personnel security | 12% | - Develop, implement, and manage, background investigations to validate individuals for hiring, promotion, or retention.
| | | - Develop, implement, manage, and evaluate policies, procedures, programs and methods to protect individuals in the workplace against harassment, threats, and violence.
| | | - Develop, implement, and manage executive protection programs.

| Physical security | 25% | - Survey facilities in order to manage and/or evaluate the current status of physical security, emergency and/or restoration capabilities.
| | | - Select, implement, and manage security processes to reduce the risk of loss.
| | | - Assess the effectiveness of the security measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information security      | 8% | - Survey information facilities, processes and systems to evaluate current status of: physical security, procedural security, information systems security, employee awareness, and information destruction and recovery capabilities  
- Develop and implement policies and standards to ensure information is protected against unauthorized/indexion access, use, disclosure, modification, destruction or denial  
- Develop and manage a program of integrated security controls and safeguards to ensure confidentiality, integrity, availability, authentication, non-repudiation, accountability, recoverability and audit ability of sensitive information and associated information technology resources, assets and investigations  
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the information security program’s integrated security controls, to include related policies, procedures and plans, to ensure consistency with organization strategy, goals and objectives |
| Crisis management         | 8% | - Assess and prioritize risks to mitigate potential consequences of incidents  
- Prepare and plan how the organization will respond to incidents  
- Respond to and manage an incident  
- Recover from incidents by managing the recovery and resumption of operations |
| Investigations            | 10%| - Develop and Manage Investigation Programs  
- Manage or conduct the collection and preservation of evidence to support post-investigation actions (employee discipline, criminal or civil proceedings, arbitration) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-Manage or conduct surveillance processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Manage and conduct specialized investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Manage or conduct investigative interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>