



LUND UNIVERSITY

Executive summary: End-user survey, autumn 2008

Lahtinen, Markus

2009

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Lahtinen, M. (2009). *Executive summary: End-user survey, autumn 2008*. (LUSAX memo series). Lusax security informatics. https://publicera.ehl.lu.se/media/lusax/lxm_ml4_enduserstudy.pdf

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00



SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
AND MANAGEMENT
Lund University



www.lusax.ehl.lu.se

LXM-ML4- End-user survey

Author: Markus Lahtinen
Subject: End-user study
Date: 2 March 2009
Pages: 2
Recipients: Public
Email: markus.lahtinen@ics.lu.se

Executive summary: End-user survey, autumn 2008

In June 2008, 53 top-tier security directors belonging to a security association responded to an on-line survey. There were several purposes of the survey: first, addressing end-user attitudes towards the digitalisation of security systems; second, understand what behaviour was associated with a role model security capability and, third, to formulate an understanding of the interaction between the demand and supply-side of the industry.

The survey consisted of three main parts; being general background variables, attitude questions and finally the section that dealt with the ranking of certain attributes when evaluating systems integrators and manufacturers. The attitude questions direct the attention to important general aspects in relation to the overarching purpose of the survey; being behavioural and organisational, relationship to technology and relationship to industry.

The median age of the respondent is 50 years old, having 20 years of experience in security and 5 years of experience within the current organisation and also of IP. The median size of the organisation is 4 500 employees.

Analysing the medians, the following observations were the most interesting: IT companies may likely serve as future security system integrator, and peers and industry colleagues main source of input regarding industry development; suggesting a professional network or 'community of practice'. IP security is a modest challenge, and internal acceptance of security strong, but still a wish for security being higher on the corporate agenda.

Also, there is an unclear role of security consultants, system integrators, trade magazines and trade shows; often no measurement of performance internally– performance get evaluated on face value and by peers, integration of video surveillance and access control still not a vision for the future, and sparse interaction with manufacturers of security equipment.

When analysing what actually matters, using simple correlation between the included questions, the following qualities explained an above average security capability: age and loyalty matters, *not* security experience; past incidents gives future security credibility, involvement and contact with the industry supply-side does not explain above average performance; security system matters, the more checkpoints/nodes, the better security and, different from the median analysis, the internal experts are important decision layer/influence for keeping updated on industry developments, not as much the industry peers and colleagues.

The last purpose was to address the nature of the interaction with the supply-side of the industry; the top three criteria for evaluating a systems integrator were the following: 'historical performance and stability', 'technical know-how' and 'price'. When evaluating the manufacturers of security equipment these were the top three criteria: 'reliability of equipment', 'historical performance' and 'price'.

PARTNERS



About the author

Markus Lahtinen is currently enrolled as Doctoral Student at The Institute of Economic Research at Lund University in Sweden. The dissertation work focuses on end-user behavioural and organisational aspects associated with the increased digitalisation of security systems. Prior to enrolling into the PhD programme, he held a position as lecturer since 2002 at the Department of Informatics at Lund University teaching mainly Human-Computer Interaction, but also Decision Support Systems and Systems Development. Past industrial experience covers freelance web development, usability consultant and working in at customer support for a portal/internet service provider. Markus holds a Master's Degree in Information Systems (2001) and a Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration and Economics (2006), both from Lund University in Sweden.