

## Surveillance Training and Global Standards: Lessons from Brazil for the United States and Challenges of International Harmonization

*Security Guard Training and Global Standards: Lessons from Brazil for the United States and Challenges of International Harmonization*

Author: Gelbis de Souza Junior

Graduated in Economics from the Catholic University of Brasília.

### Summary

Security guard training has become a strategic element in strengthening private security, especially in contexts of increasing social and technological complexity.

This article comparatively analyzes the training models adopted in Brazil, the United States, and the European Union, highlighting the importance of pedagogical innovation and international standardization for reducing risks at airports, ports, major events, and critical infrastructure. The research discusses how more modern teaching methodologies, combined with global certification standards, can increase the effectiveness of private security and strengthen its integration with public security systems. By highlighting Brazilian lessons applicable to the North American context, the study emphasizes the role of international harmonization as a path toward a more efficient, ethical, and sustainable sector.

**Keywords:** Security guards. Training. International standardization. Innovation. Private security.

### Abstract

The formation of security guards has been consolidated as a strategic element in strengthening private security, especially in contexts of growing social and technological complexity. This article comparatively analyzes the training models adopted in Brazil, the United States, and the European Union, highlighting the importance of pedagogical innovation and international standardization for risk reduction in airports, ports, major events, and critical infrastructures.

The research discusses how modern teaching methodologies, combined with global certification standards, can enhance the effectiveness of private security and strengthen its integration with public protection systems. By highlighting Brazilian lessons applicable to the North American context, the study points out international harmonization as a path toward a more efficient, ethical, and sustainable sector.

**Keywords:** Security guards. Training. International standardization. Innovation. Private security.

## 1. Introduction

Security guard training, as a structuring pillar of private security, plays an increasingly important role in an international scenario characterized by increased migration flows, economic globalization, and the increasing complexity of contemporary threats. At airports, ports, mass events, and critical infrastructure, security guards' performance is not limited to traditional static surveillance duties, but also involves technical, technological, and behavioral skills that require ongoing training and advanced pedagogical methodologies. In this context, professional training ceases to be a merely operational process and becomes part of a global security governance strategy. Therefore, discussing innovation and international standardization in security guard training fosters a debate that transcends national borders, encompassing the international security and global public policy agenda.

The relevance of this study lies in highlighting that the absence of international standards can compromise not only the quality of services provided but also the safety of citizens and critical infrastructure on a global scale. The heterogeneity of existing training models, such as those in the United States, marked by state decentralization, and those in Brazil, characterized by federal centralization, reveals advantages and disadvantages that require comparative analysis. The European Union, on the other hand, stands out for its pursuit of regional harmonization, establishing minimum training standards and promoting certifications that facilitate professional mobility and transnational cooperation. The articulation of these different models constitutes fertile ground for academic reflection and the formulation of concrete proposals for international integration.

Security guard training should also be understood as an investment in human capital and pedagogical innovation. Methodologies based on realistic simulations, virtual reality, hybrid learning, and integration with new surveillance technologies represent important advances that can increase operational efficiency and reduce risks in highly complex situations. However, the dissemination of these practices remains uneven, depending on economic, cultural, and political factors. Therefore, the analysis proposed here will seek to demonstrate that innovation in training must be accompanied by standardization efforts, so that the benefits are universal and not restricted to certain regions or groups.

Another central point of the introduction is the need to understand private security as part of a broader security architecture, in which public and private sectors act in a complementary manner. Security guards, when well-trained, become key players in crime prevention, population monitoring, and emergency management.

Their efficient performance can reduce the social and economic costs associated with crime, strengthen collective trust, and increase the legitimacy of institutions. However, the effectiveness of this process depends directly on the quality of training received, which reinforces the importance of international standards that ensure minimum levels of competence and professional ethics.



In Brazil, the standardization of training guaranteed by Law No. 7,102/1983 constitutes a relevant benchmark, requiring ongoing training and refresher courses supervised by the Federal Police. This legislation, while standardizing, also legitimizes the profession and ensures minimum qualification requirements. In the United States, on the other hand, the diversity of state regulations offers flexibility but compromises uniformity. The European Union, on the other hand, represents a middle ground, seeking to reconcile national diversity with regional integration. The comparison of these models, carried out throughout this article, will provide insights into possible paths toward global harmonization.

Pedagogical innovation is also a key element in this study, as traditional methodologies based solely on theoretical and practical classes no longer meet contemporary demands. The use of technologies such as simulators, digital platforms, and artificial intelligence in training can prepare security guards to deal with complex threats such as terrorism, cyberattacks, and transnational crimes. At the same time, the inclusion of content related to human rights, conflict mediation, and cultural diversity broadens the social and ethical dimension of the profession, ensuring greater alignment with international security governance standards.

Thus, the introduction to this article establishes the rationale for a comparative analysis of the Brazilian, North American, and European security guard training models. The objective is to understand how pedagogical innovation and international standardization can strengthen private security and expand its integration with public security systems. More than a normative discussion, this is a strategic reflection on the role of security guard training in strengthening global security, highlighting lessons learned from Brazil that can inspire adjustments in the United States and challenges that international harmonization still needs to address and overcome.

## 2. International Overview of Security Guard Training

The international panorama of security guard training reveals a diversity of regulatory and pedagogical arrangements, reflecting the historical, cultural, and political specificities of each region. In the United States, regulatory decentralization means each state establishes its own requirements for licensing, minimum course hours, and professional retraining. In states like New York and California, programs are more demanding, with courses that can exceed 40 hours, while in others, more modest requirements prevail. This heterogeneity fosters flexibility and adaptation to local realities, but compromises the uniformity of training at the national level, creating disparities in the quality of services provided.

3

In Brazil, the logic is opposite: Law No. 7,102/1983 establishes a centralized regulatory framework, regulated by the Federal Police, which requires a minimum workload of 200 hours for the initial training course and 50 hours for the biennial refresher courses. This model ensures standardization and legitimacy, offering greater predictability for contractors and public agencies. Brazilian uniformity can be considered an advantage in the face of fragmentation.



North American, but it also faces criticism, mainly due to its curriculum's lack of awareness of emerging technologies and innovative methodologies. Even so, Brazil is often cited as a benchmark for standardization in Latin America.

In the European Union, the outlook reveals consistent efforts toward regional harmonization. Directive 2005/36/EC, which addresses the recognition of professional qualifications, and documents prepared by the **Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS)** establish minimum training and certification standards that allow professionals to move between member countries. This ensures that security guards trained in one European country can work in others, increasing labor market integration and ensuring minimum levels of competence. The European experience demonstrates that it is possible to respect national specificities without sacrificing the pursuit of regional quality standards.

A comparison of these three models—North American, Brazilian, and European—highlights different possible paths for training security guards. While the United States prioritizes decentralization, Brazil focuses on centralization, and the European Union seeks regional harmonization. Each model has advantages and disadvantages: decentralization can generate innovation, but also disparities; centralization ensures uniformity but can hinder local adaptations; and harmonization requires complex political coordination but strengthens transnational cooperation. This diversity reveals that there is no single ideal model, but rather strategies adapted to specific contexts.

Another important aspect of the international landscape is the level of investment in pedagogical innovation. In the United States, many private companies invest in simulations and advanced practical training, especially in critical sectors such as aviation and port security. In the European Union, public funding and international cooperation provide access to cutting-edge technologies such as virtual reality and digital platforms. In Brazil, although advances have been made in some training centers, technology adoption remains uneven and depends on companies' financial capacity. This difference highlights that innovation in training is as much a matter of regulation as it is of economic capacity.

Also noteworthy is the inclusion of content related to human rights, cultural diversity, and conflict mediation. In the European Union, these topics are considered central, in line with international treaties and EU guidelines. In the United States, the greater emphasis is on technical and operational aspects, while in Brazil, there is a combination, but with a predominance of disciplines focused on self-defense and property surveillance. This difference in focus reflects distinct conceptions of the security guard's social role: in Europe, as an agent of citizenship; in the United States, as a technical professional; and in Brazil, as an executor of normative functions regulated by the State.

Therefore, the international landscape of security guard training is marked by regulatory, pedagogical, and cultural diversity. This heterogeneity represents both a challenge and an opportunity. On the one hand, the lack of common standards hinders transnational cooperation and compromises the effectiveness of global security. On the other hand, diversity can generate innovations and solutions adapted to local contexts. The challenge, therefore, is to find a balance between standardization and flexibility so that security guard training meets the demands.



contemporary approaches without losing sight of regional specificities. This reflection paves the way for the analysis of pedagogical and technological innovation, discussed in the next section.

### 3. Pedagogical and Technological Innovation in Training

Security guard training in the 21st century demands the incorporation of innovative pedagogical methodologies and technological resources that allow for greater realism, efficiency, and applicability in learning. The traditional model, based on expository theoretical classes and limited in-person practice, no longer meets the needs of a sector that deals daily with complex threats such as terrorism, transnational crimes, cyberattacks, and crowd management at mass events. Therefore, pedagogical innovation becomes imperative, whether through the adoption of active teaching methodologies such as simulations, case studies, and role-playing games, or through the integration of advanced digital technologies such as virtual reality, artificial intelligence, and e-learning platforms.

One example of innovation is the use of simulators for highly complex environments, such as airports and ports. These simulators allow security guards to experience risky situations in a controlled environment, developing quick reflexes and decision-making skills under pressure. In the United States, security companies and training centers already use platforms that simulate emergency evacuations, suspicious behavior detection, and response to explosive threats. In the European Union, similar initiatives are funded by EU funds, reinforcing technological integration into the training process. In Brazil, albeit on a more limited scale, some training academies already incorporate practical simulations, demonstrating a trend toward modernization.

Blended learning methodologies have also emerged as an innovative solution. By combining in-person and online classes, these methodologies allow greater flexibility for students and cost reductions for educational institutions. Digital platforms enable content review, adaptive testing, and real-time monitoring of student progress. Furthermore, gamification systems transform the learning process into a more interactive and motivating experience. In the context of private security, this means not only greater absorption of technical content but also the development of essential socio-emotional skills, such as self-control, empathy, and assertive communication.

Another relevant innovation is the integration of artificial intelligence and big data into the training process. Predictive analytics software can be used in training to teach security guards to identify suspicious patterns in crowds, correlate behavior with potential threats, and anticipate incidents. This technology is already used in countries like the United States, in partnership with airports and large urban centers. In Brazil and the European Union, its adoption is still in its infancy, but studies demonstrate its potential to revolutionize the way security guards are trained. This integration brings private security into line with the transformations of the digital society.

Pedagogical innovation also requires a paradigm shift regarding the role of the security guard. Traditionally, they were seen as passive, responsible surveillance agents.



simply by monitoring environments and responding to incidents. However, new training methodologies aim to transform them into proactive professionals, capable of preventing risks, mediating conflicts, and working collaboratively with public authorities. This involves not only acquiring technical skills but also developing cognitive and socio-emotional competencies, aligned with the principles of ethics, human rights, and cultural diversity.

This change raises the status of the profession and expands its social relevance.

In Brazil, pedagogical innovation initiatives are already beginning to take hold in some training schools, with the use of augmented reality simulators, online platforms, and partnerships with universities for applied security research. These advances, while still incipient compared to developed countries, demonstrate Brazil's ability to adapt global technologies to its regulatory and socioeconomic reality. Regulatory centralization can even favor the dissemination of these innovations by allowing new content to be incorporated uniformly throughout the country. Thus, innovation should not be seen solely as a technological resource, but as a strategy for institutional strengthening.

In short, pedagogical and technological innovation represents a game-changer in security guard training. Its incorporation increases the sector's effectiveness, reduces operational risks, and strengthens the credibility of private security as a strategic area. However, for these advances to be consolidated, it is necessary to overcome economic, regulatory, and cultural challenges, ensuring that innovations are accessible to diverse realities and not restricted to large corporations. Pedagogical transformation, combined with international standardization, is an indispensable condition for consolidating a more efficient, inclusive, and sustainable global training system.

#### 4. The Brazilian Model: Standardization and Global Lessons

The Brazilian model of security guard training presents singularities that differentiate it on the international scene, especially due to normative centralization and national standardization.

Since the enactment of Law No. 7,102/1983, regulated by the Federal Police Department, Brazil has established clear criteria for the exercise of the profession, requiring training courses with a minimum workload of 200 hours and mandatory recycling every two years.

This standardization ensures uniformity throughout the country, ensuring that all security guards, regardless of their region, possess a minimum core of technical, legal, and operational skills. This level of standardization is uncommon in countries of continental size, giving Brazil a prominent position in the global debate.

6

One of the main lessons the Brazilian model offers the world is the institutional legitimacy conferred by regulatory centralization. By being directly regulated by a federal public security agency, the private surveillance sector in Brazil achieves greater social and legal credibility. This prevents the proliferation of low-quality courses and clandestine companies, recurring problems in countries with decentralized regulation.

Standardization, in this case, ensures predictability and trust for both employers and public agencies that rely on security guards in sensitive environments, such as banks, ports, and airports. This credibility is a strategic asset that can inspire reforms in other contexts, such as the United States.

Another positive aspect of the Brazilian model is the requirement for periodic refresher courses, which ensures professionals' continuous training. This practice strengthens the culture of lifelong learning, enabling security guards to be prepared to deal with legislative changes, technological innovations, and new criminal challenges. Although the course load and content can be criticized for being outdated, the mandatory refresher course itself constitutes an advanced practice compared to more flexible systems, such as the North American one. In the United States, the lack of a federal requirement for standardized refresher courses creates disparities in professional development, which compromises effectiveness in contexts that require national coordination.

Brazilian standardization also promotes greater social inclusion by ensuring that training is offered in all regions of the country, under the same legal parameters. This guarantees opportunities for workers from different social and geographic backgrounds, reinforcing the inclusive nature of the profession. Furthermore, by standardizing training, Brazil helps reduce regional inequalities in the quality of services provided, strengthening the image of private security as an organized and legitimate sector. This inclusive dimension represents an important lesson for countries facing profound regional disparities, such as the United States and parts of the European Union.

However, the Brazilian model also faces challenges that need to be acknowledged. The main criticism concerns the curriculum's inadequacy, which remains largely focused on self-defense and property surveillance techniques, with little inclusion of content on cybersecurity, conflict mediation, and digital technologies. While the regulatory framework ensures uniformity, it can also hinder necessary adaptations in specific contexts, such as airport security or large events. Therefore, Brazil needs to update its training guidelines to incorporate innovative methodologies and contemporary content, ensuring that standardization does not become synonymous with obsolescence.

Another limitation is insufficient investment in pedagogical infrastructure. Many training schools still lack simulators, laboratories, and adequate technological resources to offer training compatible with today's challenges. This limitation compromises the quality of training, reducing the transformative potential of standardization.

Therefore, although Brazil offers valuable lessons in terms of standardization and legitimacy, it is essential that these lessons be accompanied by consistent investments in innovation, otherwise the model will become static and disconnected from global demands.

In conclusion, the Brazilian model of security guard training, by combining standardization, mandatory retraining, and institutional legitimacy, constitutes a relevant reference for the international debate. Its experience shows that normative centralization can generate credibility and inclusion, as long as it is accompanied by curricular updates and investment in pedagogical innovation. For the United States, the main lesson is that uniformity can be

an ally of quality, while for the European Union, Brazil demonstrates that countries of continental dimensions can effectively implement common standards. Thus, the Brazilian model, despite its limitations, is an example of how standardization can strengthen the sector and contribute to the development of global training standards.

## 5. The North American Model: Decentralization and Flexibility

The North American model of security guard training is marked by regulatory decentralization, a characteristic of the United States federal system. Each state has the autonomy to establish specific entry requirements, minimum workload, certifications and retraining processes. This creates a wide range of standards, ranging from basic 8-hour programs in some states to more comprehensive training programs exceeding 40 hours in states like California and New York. Decentralization, while ensuring flexibility and adaptability to local contexts, compromises national uniformity, resulting in varying qualification levels among private security professionals.

The flexibility of the North American model allows for rapid responses to emergency demands and diverse realities. States with higher crime rates may establish more stringent requirements, while others may opt for less complex processes suited to lower-risk markets. This dynamic, however, raises questions about the system's effectiveness in contexts that require national coordination, such as airport, port, and border security. The lack of a uniform minimum standard can create vulnerabilities in critical infrastructure, which depends on security personnel properly trained to deal with transnational and highly complex threats.

Another central aspect of the North American model is the strong private sector presence in defining training standards. Security companies often offer their own in-house training, complementing state requirements. This ensures greater alignment between market demands and course content, but it can also reinforce disparities, as large companies invest in sophisticated training, while smaller companies offer more limited training. This disparity impacts the quality of service and, consequently, the social perception of the effectiveness of private security.

Professional certification in the United States is administered by different state agencies, which increases the diversity of criteria. In some states, licensing requires a criminal background check, psychological testing, and proof of technical qualifications. In others, the requirements are more simplified, with participation in a basic course being sufficient. This fragmentation also affects the mobility of professionals, who often have to undergo new certification processes when moving between states. Unlike the European Union, which seeks to harmonize requirements, the United States maintains a fragmented system, which, while flexible, creates obstacles to labor market integration.

From a pedagogical perspective, decentralization also influences innovation. Some states and companies are already using advanced technologies, such as simulators.



virtual reality and digital platforms, while in others, traditional methods prevail, focusing on basic theoretical and practical classes. This heterogeneity means that the training experience of a North American security guard is heavily dependent on the state and the hiring company, making it difficult to build a unified professional identity. This situation can undermine the sector's credibility at the national level, especially in times of crisis when coordinated action becomes essential.

On the other hand, decentralization can also be seen as a space for innovation. Competition between states and companies encourages the creation of differentiated programs, adapted to local and sectoral demands. In the aviation and transportation sectors, for example, training is much more rigorous, focusing on risk management and emergency response, while in less sensitive sectors, the requirements are simpler. This adaptability gives the North American model a flexibility that can be considered advantageous compared to more rigid systems. The challenge, however, is balancing innovation and flexibility with the need for minimum quality standards.

In short, the North American model reveals the strengths and weaknesses of decentralization. Flexibility allows for adaptation and innovation, but compromises uniformity and national integration. The absence of minimum federal standards creates vulnerabilities in critical contexts and hinders professional mobility. Even so, the North American system offers important lessons on how decentralization can stimulate innovation and rapid responses to local challenges. To move forward, the United States would need to invest in national coordination mechanisms capable of reconciling state autonomy with minimum training standards, strengthening the sector's credibility globally.

## 6. The European Model: Regional Harmonization and International Certifications

The European Union represents an intermediate model between North American decentralization and Brazilian centralization, characterized by efforts toward regional harmonization. Although each country maintains regulatory autonomy, common guidelines establish minimum training standards for security guards, ensuring a basic level of qualifications across all member states. Documents from the **Confederation of European Security Services (CoESS)** and standards derived from EU directives, such as Directive 2005/36/EC on the recognition of professional qualifications, are examples of mechanisms that guide this harmonization. This approach strengthens regional integration and facilitates the mobility of professionals between countries, enhancing security on a transnational scale.

One of the main advantages of the European model is the creation of certifications that are valid in different EU countries. This system allows security guards trained in one member state to work in another without the need for extensive revalidation processes. This mobility not only expands opportunities for workers but also strengthens the integration of the private security market at a continental level. The logic is similar to

adopted in other professional areas, such as health and education, where minimum standards are established to ensure consistency and trust in transnational operations.

The European model also stands out for its incorporation of content related to human rights, cultural diversity, and conflict mediation, aligning with European Union guidelines and international treaties. This approach broadens the ethical and social dimensions of the profession, ensuring that security guards are prepared not only for technical roles but also to deal with multicultural contexts and with respect for human dignity. In diverse and highly interconnected societies like Europe, this approach is essential to legitimizing private security activities in the public eye.

Another strength of the European model is its investment in pedagogical and technological innovation, often financed by EU funds earmarked for security and applied research. Countries like Germany, France, and the United Kingdom (before Brexit) have excelled in the use of advanced simulators, digital platforms, and interdisciplinary training that involves cooperation with public agencies. This integration of technology and standardization strengthens the credibility of training and ensures that security guards are equipped to deal with contemporary threats such as terrorism, cyberattacks, and managing large population flows during mass events.

However, European harmonization also faces significant challenges. Despite the existence of minimum standards, there are substantial differences in the quality of training between countries, due to economic and cultural factors. Countries with greater investment capacity offer more sophisticated training, while countries with fewer resources maintain more basic programs. This inequality partially compromises the objectives of harmonization, revealing that normative standardization needs to be accompanied by financing policies and technical support to ensure greater equity among member states.

Another challenge is the need to reconcile national legislation with EU guidelines. In some cases, there is political resistance to the adoption of common standards, especially in countries that value regulatory autonomy. This tension between national sovereignty and regional integration is characteristic of the European Union and directly impacts the consolidation of a fully harmonized system. Even so, the progress achieved already represents a benchmark for other regions, demonstrating that it is possible to establish minimum standards without eliminating national diversity.

In short, the European model represents a significant effort toward regional harmonization, balancing national autonomy and continental integration. Its main strengths lie in the creation of transnational certifications, the incorporation of ethical and cultural content, and investment in pedagogical innovation. Despite inequalities and political resistance, the European model offers important lessons for countries like the United States and Brazil, demonstrating that the pursuit of international standards is both possible and desirable. This experience reinforces the thesis that global standardization of security guard training, while challenging, is a viable path to addressing increasingly interconnected threats.

## 7. Challenges of International Harmonization

International harmonization in security guard training presents one of the greatest challenges facing the contemporary private security sector. While globalization and the intensification of transnational threats indicate the need for common standards, cultural, economic, and political differences hinder the creation of a uniform global framework. Each country, or regional bloc, has its own security priorities, legal frameworks, and investment capabilities. In the United States, for example, normative decentralization reflects the federative model, while in Brazil, centralization aligns with the state's role as a regulator of the sector. The European Union, on the other hand, seeks to reconcile national diversity and regional integration but faces political resistance. This heterogeneity makes international harmonization a complex and gradual process.

One of the main obstacles is economics. Countries with greater investment capacity can implement sophisticated training programs, using cutting-edge technologies and innovative methodologies. Conversely, developing countries, such as much of Latin America and Africa, face financial constraints that hinder the adoption of high standards. This inequality creates a training gap, in which security guards from poorer countries do not have access to the same training opportunities as their peers in rich countries. In an interconnected world, this disparity can compromise global security, as threats do not respect geographic borders.

Another significant challenge is linked to cultural and legal differences. While in some countries, the security guard profession is highly valued and legitimized, in others, it is still seen as a marginal or informal activity. This perception directly influences the quality and structure of training programs. Furthermore, legal differences regarding the use of force, carrying weapons, and interaction with public authorities make it difficult to create a uniform global curriculum. For example, in the United States, carrying weapons by security guards is more common and accepted, while in Europe, it is more restricted. These differences reveal the need for contextual adaptations, even in harmonization processes.

Political resistance also poses a significant barrier. Many countries view security as a matter of national sovereignty, resisting the idea of ceding some of this control to international standards. International cooperation in private security is therefore limited by power struggles and fears of external interference. Even in integrated regional blocs, such as the European Union, there are tensions between national legislation and EU guidelines. This scenario highlights that international harmonization is not only a technical issue, but also a political one, requiring complex negotiations and mutual concessions.

There are still pedagogical challenges. The diversity of teaching methodologies and technological gaps in some countries make it difficult to adopt standardized programs. While developed countries already use virtual reality simulators and digital platforms, others still rely on in-person classes and traditional content. This disparity compromises the effectiveness of standardization, as creating common standards is insufficient if the material and pedagogical conditions to implement them are not in place. Harmonization, therefore,

needs to be accompanied by global investments in teaching infrastructure, teacher training and access to technology.

Despite the challenges, there are advances that signal possibilities for convergence. International organizations, such as the **International Security League** and CoESS itself, have promoted debates and established recommendations that can serve as the basis for future global standards. Furthermore, large multinational security companies already operate in different countries, imposing their own training practices that serve as informal standardization models. These examples demonstrate that international harmonization, while complex, is feasible and necessary. The challenge is to transform isolated practices into widely accepted and formalized policies.

In short, international harmonization faces economic, cultural, legal, and political barriers, but it also presents concrete opportunities for progress. Transnational cooperation, the strengthening of international organizations, and the dissemination of best practices can provide ways to overcome these barriers. The future of private security depends on the ability to reconcile diversity and uniformity, creating international standards that respect local specificities while ensuring minimum levels of quality. In this context, security guard training should be seen not only as a national issue, but as a global security governance challenge.

## 8. Applications in Critical Infrastructure and Mass Events

Security guard training based on innovative, international standards finds its most obvious application in highly complex contexts, such as the protection of critical infrastructure and security at mass gatherings. Airports, ports, refineries, power plants, and transportation systems are potential targets of threats that can compromise not only local security but also the economic and political stability of entire regions. Therefore, the quality of training for security guards working in these spaces is crucial for preventing incidents and responding effectively to emergencies. A lack of adequate training can transform vulnerabilities into major crises.

At airports, for example, the work of security guards is essential to complement public safety and technological systems. Identifying suspicious behavior, responding in emergencies, and supporting law enforcement forces require solid training that combines technical and cognitive skills. In European Union countries, training programs for airport security guards include training in crowd management, access control, and response to terrorist attacks. In the United States, the emphasis is on specific training overseen by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), while in Brazil, although progress has been made, curricula still need to be updated to address contemporary threats such as cyberattacks and bioterrorism.

Ports represent another strategic area of application. Responsible for the transportation of a large portion of international trade, ports require trained security guards to

monitor the flow of goods, prevent smuggling, and ensure the security of logistics operations. In this context, international training standards are essential, as ports connect different countries and continents. Cooperation between security guards of different nationalities, trained in compatible methodologies, can increase security effectiveness and reduce the risk of failures in the logistics chain. The European example, with certifications that enable professional mobility, demonstrates the potential of harmonization for highly interconnected sectors.

Mass events, such as World Cups, Olympics, concerts, and public demonstrations, also require highly qualified security guards. Managing large population flows involves the risk of mass panic, violence, and coordinated attacks. In such contexts, innovative and standardized training is essential for security guards to work in synergy with public forces, ensuring the safety of thousands of people. Brazil already experienced this reality in 2014 and 2016, when large contingents of security guards were mobilized to complement police operations. These cases highlight that training should include specific modules on security at mass events, crisis management, and conflict mediation.

Another field of application is power plants, refineries, and telecommunications systems, considered critical infrastructure by most countries. Protecting these sites requires highly trained security personnel capable of identifying vulnerabilities and responding to incidents that could compromise the operation of essential services. The integration between security personnel and technical teams, such as engineers and technology specialists, requires multidisciplinary training that goes beyond the traditional competencies of private security. The absence of international standards can compromise the effectiveness of this integration, reinforcing the need for innovative and global training methodologies.

In addition to operational work, training for security guards for critical infrastructure and mass events must include skills related to human rights, ethics and diversity. Cultural. These elements are fundamental to ensuring that private security operations are in line with democratic principles and respect for citizenship. At major international events, the presence of multicultural audiences requires security guards prepared to deal with different social and cultural contexts, avoiding conflicts and ensuring social legitimacy for their actions. This ethical dimension is as important as the technical one, as it ensures the acceptance of private security by society.

In summary, the applications of security guard training in critical infrastructure and mass events highlight the need for international standards that ensure quality and effectiveness. The heterogeneity of training models compromises global security in strategic sectors and in situations involving large population flows. International harmonization, combined with pedagogical innovation, is essential for security guards to operate in an integrated and efficient manner across different countries and contexts. Thus, security guard training ceases to be a matter restricted to the private sector and becomes a central theme for global security in the 21st century.



## Conclusion

The analysis of innovation and international standardization in security guard training demonstrated that this issue transcends national borders, becoming a global security governance challenge. In a world marked by the intensified flow of people, goods, and information, the need for well-trained security guards is increasingly evident. The comparative study of the models in Brazil, the United States, and the European Union allowed us to identify the strengths and limitations of each system, as well as point to possible paths for international harmonization. Thus, it is clear that the quality of training is crucial for the effectiveness of private security in critical environments and for its social legitimacy within the community.

From a Brazilian perspective, the regulatory centralization guaranteed by Law No. 7,102/1983 proved to be a strength, conferring standardization and credibility on the profession. This uniformity, coupled with the requirement for periodic refresher training, gives Brazil a prominent position in Latin America and offers relevant lessons for countries that, like the United States, face difficulties in standardizing minimum requirements. The Brazilian experience shows that centralization can be an effective way to ensure quality, as long as it is accompanied by curricular updates and consistent investment in pedagogical infrastructure.

In the United States, regulatory decentralization reflects federal logic but compromises the uniformity of training. While flexibility allows for rapid responses and innovation in some states, it also creates significant disparities among professionals. This fragmentation impacts strategic sectors, such as airports and ports, where coordinated action is essential. The North American model, therefore, reveals the importance of reconciling state autonomy with minimum national standards, balancing flexibility with credibility. The absence of federal standardization mechanisms limits the system's effectiveness and represents a vulnerability in global security contexts.

The European Union, on the other hand, offers an intermediate model, in which community guidelines seek to harmonize minimum training standards while respecting national autonomy. The creation of transnational certifications and the incorporation of ethical and cultural content reinforce the relevance of the European model as a reference for other regional blocs. However, economic inequalities and political resistance still hinder the consolidation of a fully harmonized system. Even so, the European experience demonstrates that it is possible to move toward integration without eliminating cultural and normative diversity between countries.

Another key point identified was the importance of pedagogical and technological innovation. Security guard training, historically centered on traditional methods, needs to incorporate modern tools such as simulators, virtual reality, artificial intelligence, and digital platforms. These innovations prepare professionals to deal with contemporary threats such as terrorism, cyberattacks, and crowd management at mass events.

Furthermore, the introduction of active methodologies increases student engagement and favors

the development of socio-emotional skills. Pedagogical innovation, therefore, should be seen as a strategic axis for the future of private security.

International harmonization, while necessary, faces economic, cultural, legal, and political barriers. Countries with lower investment capacity will have difficulty adopting high standards, while legal differences regarding the carrying of weapons or the use of force can hinder common curricula. Furthermore, security is often viewed as a matter of sovereignty, generating resistance to the adoption of international standards. Overcoming these barriers requires multilateral cooperation, shared investment, and the strengthening of international organizations capable of mediating divergent interests.

The application of international standards in security guard training has proven particularly relevant in highly complex contexts, such as airports, ports, mass events, and critical infrastructure. In these environments, training failures can generate major crises, affecting not only local security but also global economic and political stability. Brazil's experience with major events, such as the 2014 World Cup and the 2016 Olympics, illustrates the importance of integrating public and private security, supported by well-trained security guards. This reality reinforces the urgency of international harmonization to prevent vulnerabilities in strategic sectors.

From a social perspective, security guard training must also include ethical and human rights content to legitimize the sector's actions within society. In multicultural contexts, such as the European Union, or those with significant social inequality, such as Brazil, ethical preparation is as important as technical preparation. Security guards trained to deal with cultural diversity, mediate conflicts, and respect citizenship broaden social acceptance of private security and strengthen collective trust. This element is essential for the sector to cease being seen solely as an instrument of private protection and become recognized as an integral part of a democratic security architecture.

Future prospects indicate that private security will continue to expand, driven by urban growth, the digitalization of society, and the intensification of transnational threats. The security guard training sector will be increasingly in demand, requiring greater pedagogical innovation and international standardization efforts. Countries like Brazil have the potential to export their normative standardization experiences, while blocs like the European Union offer regional integration models that can serve as a global benchmark. The key to the future will be the ability to reconcile innovation, standardization, and inclusion, ensuring that private security consolidates itself as an efficient, ethical, and socially legitimized sector.

In short, security guard training must be understood as a global challenge that requires joint and integrated responses. International harmonization, while complex, is an indispensable condition for effectively addressing 21st-century threats. By investing in pedagogical innovation, curricular updates, transnational certifications, and ethical content, private security can fully fulfill its role as a complement to public security and a pillar of sustainable development. Therefore, it can be concluded that professionalization and

International standardization in security guard training represents not only an advance for the sector, but a strategic necessity for global security.

## References

ASIS INTERNATIONAL. *Global Security Report 2019*. Alexandria: ASIS International, 2019.

BUTTON, M. *Private Policing*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2019.

CLARKE, RV *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. 2nd ed. Albany: Harrow and Heston, 2017.

CONFEDERATION OF EUROPEAN SECURITY SERVICES – COESS. *European Private Security Services Report*. Brussels: CoESS, 2019.

FENAVIST – National Federation of Security and Valuables Transportation Companies. *Sector Report on Private Security in Brazil*. Brasília: Fenavist, 2018.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CALL. *Private Security and International Standards*. Geneva: ISL, 2020.

US BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS. *Occupational Outlook Handbook: Security Guards*. Washington: BLS, 2020.

ZAFFARONI, E.R. *Criminology: Sociological and Legal Approach*. São Paulo: Revista dos Tribunais, 2018.