

CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION
IN PUBLIC PLACES:
ITS ACCEPTABILITY AND
PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS

Terry Honess
Elizabeth Charman

POLICE RESEARCH GROUP
CRIME PREVENTION UNIT SERIES: PAPER NO.35
LONDON: HOME OFFICE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Editor: Gloria Laycock
Home Office Police Research Group
50 Queen Anne's Gate
London SW1H 9AT

©Crown Copyright 1992
First Published 1992

Crime Prevention Unit Papers

The Home Office Police Research Group (PRG) was formed in 1992 to carry out and manage research relevant to the work of the police service and Home Office Policy Divisions. One of the major police department divisions which acts as customer for the PRG is the Home Office Crime Prevention Unit which was formed in 1983 to promote preventative action against crime. It has a particular responsibility to disseminate information on crime prevention topics.

The object of the present series of occasional papers is to present research material in a way which should help and inform practitioners, including the police, whose work can help reduce crime.

ISBN 0-86252-711-2

Foreword

Closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras are now a common sight on public highways and in shopping malls and arcades. As the number of systems has increased so has their technological sophistication. But little is known about public opinion towards CCTV or indeed about how the systems are used by those who install them.

In 1991 the Home Office commissioned a comprehensive examination of public attitudes towards a number of issues surrounding the use of CCTV including public awareness of CCTV systems; their perceived purpose and effectiveness; concern over their use and who the public feel should and who should not be allowed to install CCTV and have subsequent access to taped material. The results of this work are described in this report.

Further work is now underway looking at the actual effect CCTV systems have on crime and disorder on the streets.

I M BURNS
Deputy Under Secretary of State
Home Office,
Police Department
May 1992

Acknowledgements

The considerable co-operation afforded by Avon & Somerset, South Glamorgan and West Midlands Police is gratefully acknowledged as is the support and interest of members of the CPU, particularly Malcolm Ramsay and Gloria Laycock.

The research presented in this paper reflects the very significant involvement of other members of the project team set up under the auspices of Michael and Associates, an independent social policy research organisation. Particular thanks go to Neil Frude, psychology consultant, Michael Maguire, criminology consultant, Howard Williamson, sociology consultant and Julia Shearn, research assistant.

Terry Honess
Elizabeth Charman

The Authors

Terry Honess is a Senior Lecturer and Elizabeth Charman a Senior Research Associate in the School of Psychology, University of Wales, Cardiff.

Contents

	Page
Foreword	(iii)
Acknowledgements	(iv)
List of Tables	(vi)
1. Introduction	1
2. The Research Programme	4
General survey of public attitudes	4
Site specific survey of public attitudes	4
Group discussions	5
Contact with managers of CCTV systems	5
Case studies of particular sites	5
Crime statistics and other reported incidents	5
Structure of the report	5
3. Public awareness of CCTV systems	6
General levels of awareness of CCTV systems	6
Levels of awareness in respect of particular CCTV installations	6
Extent to which managers seek to make the public aware of CCTV systems	7
4. Public concern over CCTV systems	8
Sex and age differences in public concern	11
Fear of crime levels and public concern	11
Public concern in sites with CCTV and in sites without CCTV	11
Extent to which CCTV is welcomed by the public	12
Extent to which managers have addressed the public concern issue	12
5. Responsibility for the installation of the CCTV systems	13
6. Access to tapes and their subsequent use	15
Views of public on access to and use of tapes	15
Way in which managers governed use of CCTV tapes	15
7. Perceived purpose of CCTV systems	17
Public perceptions of the purpose of CCTV systems	17
Ways in which managers use CCTV systems	17
8. Perceived effectiveness of CCTV systems	19
Public perceptions of effectiveness	19
Managers' perceptions of effectiveness	22

Contents continued

	Page
9. Conclusions	25
10. Appendices	
A: Survey Sampling	26
B: General survey questionnaire	27
C: Site specific questionnaires	31
D: Group discussions	36
E: Case studies	37
F: Construction of attitude scales	38

List of figures

Figure No.	Caption	Page
1	Sample design for the public attitude surveys	4

List of Tables

Table No.	Caption	Page
1	Awareness of CCTV in shopping centres, city streets and car parks from the general survey	6
2	Number of respondents who expressed worries about CCTV by site	8
3	Public opinion on who should/should not be allowed to make decisions to install CCTV in public places	13
4	Public perception of the possible uses of CCTV	17
5	Perceived effectiveness of CCTV on crime detection, crime prevention and personal safety	19
6	Rank ordering of the perceived impact of CCTV on crime and disorder	21

1. Introduction

There has been a considerable growth in recent years in the use of Closed Circuit Television Systems (CCTV) in sites to which the public has free access, and there has been much debate over the deployment and possible regulation of such systems. However, there is surprisingly little independent research that directly asks the following:

Are such systems acceptable to the public?

What is their effectiveness?

Effectiveness in respect of the reduction of crime and disorder is the focus of a second research programme that is currently being undertaken for the Home Office. This report focuses on potential public concern and the perceived effectiveness of CCTV.

That there has been concern in some quarters is evident from the following:

"Video surveillance ... touches on a wide range of civil liberty issues including privacy, free association, and the democratic accountability of the police and other institutions ... We need to reduce the risk of abuse before it is too late." (Liberty Briefing 16, October 1989)

Nevertheless, it is clear that any expressed concern is always qualified by reference to the situation in which the cameras are used, the reasons for their use and the degree to which this is covert. At one extreme there is the covert surveillance of individuals in their own homes, for which the 1984 Police and Criminal Evidence Act recommends regulation by statute. At the other extreme there is the widely accepted use of CCTV in such places as Building Society branches. Indeed, the Liberty briefing document referred to above allows that "... in many of its applications video surveillance is accepted as useful and even necessary".

At present, there are no statutory controls on the use of CCTV in public places, and the existing Home Office guidelines (Home Office Circular, 1984) are now generally acknowledged to be inadequate: they focus primarily on audio surveillance and there is only one specific recommendation on the general visual surveillance of public places. This is simply that the "Chief Constable should satisfy himself that the use of the equipment will not involve any unwarrantable intrusion of privacy".

Guidelines emanating from the private sector are no more detailed: the 1988 BSIA (British Security Industry Association) Code of Practice for CCTV refers to technical matters only and the amended version (June 1990) only suggests "that there is no undue intrusion to the public's general right to privacy".

The lack of Home Office guidelines specifically designed for visual surveillance has also led to some frustration within parts of the police service itself. A recent ACPO working party comments

"There seems to be an unnecessary cavilling in the (1984) guidelines, which may well have been in step with public opinion concerning listening devices but seems unnecessary in respect of photography in public places at least". (ACPO report cited in Police Review, p.1916, September 1989)

Moreover, in respect of collecting reliable evidence for potential prosecution, the same working party argues that:

"The camera, recording in a public place, sees no more nor less than a plainclothes officer sees and is certainly a more accurate record. There is no reason why conduct in a public place should entail rights of privacy."

The lack of guidelines coupled with unsupported assumptions about public opinion has led to ad hoc developments in respect of written codes of practice. No matter how helpful such guidelines may be, they necessarily reflect local pressures and factors unique to the particular system in question. For example, the constructive and often cited code developed by the Norfolk Police Committee (1990) provides detailed advice on tape storage, but provides no guidance on how to ensure adequate consultation prior to the installation or the enhancement of CCTV. Nor does the Norfolk code give guidance on the reporting of CCTV related incidents. In addition, the Norfolk code is not designed for CCTV schemes where police involvement is relatively insignificant, or where the primary role of a scheme is not crime control, but serves some other management function.

The position in respect of advice on the deployment, effectiveness or control of CCTV systems is further complicated by the sheer variety of schemes in operation. At a technical level, systems ranged from a handful of humble, fixed black and white cameras with no recording facilities to state-of-the-art pan tilt zoom combinations of colour and black and white cameras with multiplexed and alternative recording options in purpose built control rooms. In terms of collaboration between lead agencies' and others, notably the police, there are very different operating practices. Most schemes retain close contact with the police, but there are also some where there is no formal acknowledgement of police involvement whatsoever.

Existing systems are continually updated, so any controlled evaluation of technical or organisational changes in the use of CCTV is complex. Moreover, developments in CCTV typically form part of a package of other changes relating to security and more efficient management. Finally, the generally held assumption that CCTV is all about crime control is also unfounded. The CCTV managers sampled in this research usually saw CCTV as part of a relatively wide ranging organisational initiative. Four closely inter-related aims for such change are identified by managers: efficient management, public reassurance and increased customer flow as well as crime control.

An evaluation of public concern and the perceived effectiveness of CCTV must take the above factors into account.

2. The Research Programme

The research programme addressed the two central research questions concerning public acceptability and perceived effectiveness. It consisted of six main elements.

i. General survey of public attitudes

This survey was designed to measure individuals' awareness of CCTV; their perceptions of its purposes and capabilities, and any public concern in respect of implications for civil liberties. Details of the sample are contained in figure 1. Further information concerning the sampling process is provided in appendix A and the General Survey questionnaire is provided in appendix B.

Figure 1: Sample design for the public attitude surveys

1. GENERAL STREET SURVEY	
N= 798	
(Cardiff, n=200; Bristol, n=200; Birmingham, n=200; Coventry, n= 198)	
2. SITE SPECIFIC SURVEYS	
N=1839	
With CCTV	Without CCTV
Town centre streets, local authority-led scheme (n=305)	Town Centre streets (n=239) plus 60 night time interviews
Town centre streets, police-led scheme (n=247)	
Shopping centre, private sector scheme (n=299)	Shopping Centre (n=287)
Car park, private sector scheme (n=201)	Car park (n=201)

ii. Site specific surveys of public attitudes

These surveys were designed to measure individuals' perceptions of the impact of CCTV on feelings of safety and on site relevant crimes and disorder in streets, shopping centres and car parks. The survey data were collected from four sites with a CCTV installation: two city centre street sites, one shopping centre and one car park. Data were also collected from three sites without a CCTV installation: city centre streets, shopping centre and car park (see figure 1). Street sites received most research attention because it is here that civil liberties implications are likely to be more pronounced. The site specific survey questionnaire for streets with CCTV is provided in appendix C.

Unless stated otherwise, wherever findings are discussed in this report in respect of the general or site specific surveys, the result is statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Hi. Group discussions

This work was included for the purpose of exploring issues raised in the General Survey and the Site Specific Survey in more detail. The work involved discussions with small groups of people who were likely to have differing perspectives on the study issues. Details of the groups and the format of the discussions are provided in Appendix D.

iv. Contact with managers of CCTV systems

Contact was based on a combination of telephone interviews and postal questionnaires with those involved in managing 26 different CCTV systems in car parks, shopping centres and streets. The interviews and questionnaires gave information on (i) the aims and process of setting up each system; (ii) the running of the system including such issues as procedures for access to tapes and (iii) the effectiveness of the system.

v. Case studies of particular sites

Four case studies of CCTV installations were undertaken to expand on issues raised in the survey of CCTV managers. Details of the sites chosen and data collection are provided in Appendix E. Targeted informants within each site included:

Scheme management (including senior security personnel) Security staff Police (who liaised with the scheme) Shopkeepers (in town centre and shopping centre schemes) So called Deviants' (drunks and youths who might be targets' of CCTV)

vi. Crime statistics and other reported incidents

Recorded CCTV related incidents at each of the four case study sites were analysed in conjunction with available crime statistics to help determine the effectiveness of CCTV.

Structure of the Report

The research findings are discussed in the following Sections:

3. Public awareness of CCTV systems
4. Public concern over CCTV systems
5. Responsibility for the installation of the CCTV systems
6. Access to tapes and their subsequent use
7. Perceived purpose of CCTV systems
8. Perceived effectiveness of CCTV systems
9. Conclusions

3. Public awareness of CCTV systems

General levels of awareness of CCTV systems

In the general survey of public attitudes most people (63%) were able, without prompting, to name at least one site where they were aware of the operation of CCTV - most commonly shops, banks and building societies. When provided with a list of possible locations, almost all reported seeing CCTV in a number of other places. However, there was a marked difference in the awareness of CCTV in these different locations: shops and banks/building societies were quoted most frequently (by 94% and 86% of respondents respectively) whereas subways and housing estates were each quoted by less than 10%. This variation is likely to be due to two factors. First, the number of CCTV installations in shops and banks/building societies is greater; secondly, such installations have a 'higher profile'. Indeed, a substantial number of respondents referred to television programmes such as 'CrimeWatch' as a source of their information about CCTV.

Of particular interest is the general level of awareness of CCTV systems in the types of site chosen for the 'site specific surveys' as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Awareness of CCTV in shopping centres, city streets and car parks from the general survey

	Frequency	Percentage
Shopping centres	492	61.7
City streets	276	34.6
Car parks	249	31.2

1: Total number of respondents = 798

Finally, respondents were also asked if they were aware of any other CCTV locations. A quarter were able to provide further examples, the biggest grouping of which related to traffic control e.g., cameras on motorway bridges. The remainder, which were mentioned only occasionally, were as diverse as public toilets and zoos.

Levels of awareness in respect of particular CCTV installations

In each of the two street sites with CCTV, one third of respondents were aware of the actual installations. There was, however, a sex difference, with significantly more men than women (42% compared to 25%) saying they were aware of the CCTV cameras. This sex difference in awareness may be related to men's greater expressed concerns over the civil liberty implications of CCTV.

In both the car park and shopping centre locations with CCTV there were relatively low levels of awareness of the systems: 10% for the car park and 14% for the shopping

centre. The car park finding is surprising in that the business complex served by the car park advertises their CCTV system in support of a marketing strategy based on the notion of "a safe and secure environment". However, it is plausible that level of awareness is closely related to possible concerns over CCTV, which were found to be particularly low in car park sites. The low level of awareness of CCTV in the shopping centre is unsurprising in that the cameras are deliberately concealed.

Extent to which managers seek to make the public aware of their CCTV systems

Only one of the user managers of the thirty schemes contacted indicated that their camera system was entirely surreptitious, though another two (including one case study site) had cameras which were "concealed, but not really hidden". The case study site manager made the point that siting the cameras too prominently may instil undue concern in the minds of the general public that the shopping centre was "a dangerous place". There was no desire to conceal the existence of CCTV, but the respondent's view was that prominent notices and cameras would have a marginal effect on criminal activity and a detrimental impact on public reassurance:

"Those with criminal intent recognise a video globe for what it is ... the public don't. It's not a secret, we'll tell people if they are interested".

Two other schemes operated with a combination of both hidden and prominent cameras and the remainder of the thirty investigated maintained that their cameras were all located in prominent positions. However, only three scheme managers reported they had notices advising the public of the existence of their CCTV system.

4. Public concern over CCTV systems

The majority in the site specific surveys said they did not have worries about the use of CCTV in that particular site. Of those who did, there were some differences between sites ' see Table 2.

Table 2 Number of respondents who expressed worries about CCTV by site

	Frequency	Percentage	Total Number of respondents
Street (night)	10	16.6	60
Street (day)	67	8.7	771
Shopping Centre	25	4.3	586
Car Park	7	18	396

1. Total number of respondents excludes missing data

The nature of these worries varied, but the majority of responses related to one of six main issues:

- (i) Controllers might 'look for' incidents to justify installation costs
- (ii) Controllers of CCTV might abuse the system
- (iii) Once installed, CCTV might be used in covert ways
- (iv) There was a general unease at 'being watched'
- (v) CCTV 'evidence' might be misleading
- (vi) There may be a gradual erosion of civil liberties

Data from the general survey and the group discussions are also relevant to a discussion of these six issues.

Controllers might 'look for' incidents to justify installation costs

Some participants in the group discussions felt that the pressures to demonstrate the effectiveness of having a CCTV system installed, in terms of dealing with potential crime/incivilities, may lead to those monitoring the cameras over-scrutinising particular groups - e.g., young black males, "scruffy people" - without due cause. Group participants commented that "such selectivity is dangerous" in terms of potential infringement of civil liberties.

Controllers of CCTV might abuse the system

Some respondents felt that police control might "lead to a police state" so there is a need for an independent body in control, whilst others felt that control by anyone other than the police might lead to abuse of the system by particular interest groups.

Additional information on concern about the issue of control comes from the attitude scale used in the General Survey. In contrast to the low proportions expressing specific concerns unprompted, the majority (72%) agreed with the statement that "these cameras could easily be abused and used by the wrong people" (although who the 'wrong people' are was not specified). Thirty eight per cent of respondents in the General Survey agreed that people who are in control of these systems could not be "completely trusted to use them only for the public good"; and 37% felt that "in the future cameras will be used by the government to control people". However, care must be taken in interpreting the last finding as, for some, this represented undesirable state control of the public, whereas for others it represented a welcome tighter control of criminal activity.

Once installed, CCTV might be used in covert ways

For those who worried about this, there was concern not so much about the manifest purposes of CCTV, but its potential for covert use. This issue may underlie some responses to the attitude scale in the General Survey. Only 11% agreed with the statement that "these are really spy cameras and should be banned". However, when they were asked for what purposes they thought these cameras were actually being used, 41% included "to spy on people" alongside other uses such as crime deterrence and crime detection.

Several of the discussion groups raised the concern that CCTV might also be used by security staff for "entertainment purposes" (potential 'Peeping Tom' element of CCTV) or, indeed, the blackmail of people who may be involved in personal and private activities (e.g., extra-marital affairs).

There was a general unease at 'being watched'

The nature of this unease was vague - one person said that the "quality of life is affected by knowing that you are being watched". Data collected from the general survey once again appears to link into this issue. When asking about the capabilities of CCTV cameras, interviewers noted that a substantial number of individuals expressed some surprise at the notion of systems being able to a) pick-up close-ups of people's faces and b) pick up conversations as well as pictures (although it should be noted that none of the schemes surveyed in this research could pick up conversation).

There appeared to be a conception of CCTV cameras being "somewhere up there, surveying the scene" - which seemed generally acceptable, rather than "zooming into

our personal business" - which gave rise to some unease/concern. Such concern was very evident in the group discussions, particularly in relation to the capability of cameras to pick up conversations. This was seen as qualitatively different from visual scrutiny by CCTV which one participant described as, "only one more person watching you than you've got on the streets anyway".

However, not everyone was happy about being observed; the attitude scale on the general survey showed that 36% agreed that CCTV cameras do invade people's privacy. The issue of the use of 'hidden cameras' drew a mixed response. Around 60% agreed that people at least had a right to know when they were being watched by a camera (possibly via a large notice) but 59% felt that in some circumstances "it is O.K. to use hidden cameras" and the majority of participants in the group discussions agreed with this ("it's O.K. if you're trying to catch drug pushers or something") although a small minority felt it was unacceptable under any circumstances. Generally speaking, questionnaire respondents and group participants were much more comfortable with the notion of CCTV cameras watching property than '(tracking people down city streets"'.

CCTV 'evidence' might be misleading

This issue was discussed extensively by participants in the group sessions. It was felt quite strongly that there was potential for what was seen on CCTV monitors/ videotapes to be misleading as inappropriate inferences could be drawn from inadequate information (e.g., poor picture quality, lack of sound, small monitoring screen) and could be further compounded by the people monitoring the activity operating on stereotypical expectations (e.g., grouping of young males = gang of troublemakers) which could lead to 'innocent' actions being misinterpreted. Of particular concern to participants in the youth groups was the notion of being 'guilty by association' if seen talking to someone who has previously been in trouble with the police.

One other concern raised in several of the group discussions was the potential for videotapes to be tampered with and then presented as evidence under the banner that "the camera does not lie".

There may be a gradual erosion of civil liberties

Some group participants and survey respondents talked of a possible 'snowball effect', i.e., although specific installations or procedures may not be of concern in themselves, "They start by taking some liberties and then...".

A final concern raised by members of the discussion groups was not directly related to civil liberties, but to crime control in general i.e., that CCTV systems might be used as a substitute for more proactive police activity such as an increased presence of uniformed officers 'on the beat'.

Sex and age differences in public concern

In the site specific street survey, male respondents (12% compared to 5% females) and those between 20-29 years of age (17% compared with 6% for the other age groups combined) were more worried about CCTV installation in the specified streets. This age group were also least welcoming of CCTV being installed, and were most concerned about its use in other places.

The general survey revealed sex differences on three attitude items: females were more likely to endorse the items 'Only criminals need to fear CCTV, 'The more of these cameras we have the better', and 'People who control CCTV can be trusted'. Other evidence of sex and age differences in respect of concerns over CCTV comes from the overall attitude measure. Males are significantly more likely to be represented in the 'anti' group, as are the 20-29 year age range, followed by the 30-59 year old group. The over sixties are the least likely to take an 'anti' CCTV position.

In contrast to the survey data, the female participants in the group discussions were those who expressed the most concerns about civil liberties. This seems surprising, as it might be expected that women would be more likely to feel the 'pay off of CCTV in reducing crimes like sexual assault and physical attack. However, these women reported that although CCTV might help reduce minor crime (e.g., vandalism) it did not make them feel that the threat of attack was reduced compared to other measures such as increased police patrol or better street lighting, and therefore the civil liberties issues predominated in the discussion groups.

Fear of Crime levels and public concern

In respect of 'Fear of Crime' (FOC): 'Do you ever worry about the possibility that you or anyone else who lives with you might be the victim of crime?', there were no significant associations with worries over CCTV or whether or not it would be welcome in the street sites. However, when the more sensitive measure of FOC is used (see Appendix F) higher FOC was associated with lower concern over CCTV.

Public concern in sites with CCTV and in sites without CCTV

There was no statistically significant difference between 'with' and 'without' sites in terms of those who had worries about CCTV street installations. It might have been expected that those in sites with CCTV may have had some of their fears either allayed or substantiated by experience. However, a possible explanation for the lack of difference is that only around one third of those in each of the 'with CCTV sites reported they were aware of the CCTV system being in place prior to being interviewed. As such they were in the same position as those in the 'without CCTV site, in that they were considering a new idea, rather than reporting attitudes formed through experience. Further analysis revealed that people who already knew about the existence of the systems were more worried about its use compared to those who learned of its existence at the interview.

For each of the Site Specific Surveys, more people expressed concern about the use of CCTV in 'other places' than had expressed concern in that particular site. This was most marked for shopping centres where only 4% had worries within the site, but 17% had worries about CCTV installation elsewhere. The highest figure was from the small night time sample of sixty - 29% expressed concern over the siting of CCTV in other places. An explanation for these findings relates to the types of 'other places' respondents cited as causing concern about the possible installation of CCTV: places of entertainment such as pubs, restaurants, cinemas and residential areas. In such cases, CCTV was seen as a potential invasion into home and social life rather than the 'business' of city centre streets and shopping centres.

Extent to which CCTV is welcomed by the public

This issue was addressed in the Site Specific Surveys and was designed to elicit overall evaluations about the installation of CCTV in particular sites. Eighty five per cent of those from Shopping Centre Sites, 89% from the Street Sites (small night time sample only 73%) and 92% from the Car Park Sites said they welcomed (or would welcome) the installation of CCTV in that particular site.

However, an important qualification to this generally positive endorsement comes from the General Survey: 36% of respondents said they did not feel that "the more of these cameras we have the better". In addition, all of the discussion groups raised the point that there needs to be a limit to the type of places where CCTV is installed such as public toilets ("where will all this surveillance stop?") and the facilities which are installed (e.g., microphones for picking up conversation).

Extent to which managers have addressed the public concern issue

A minority of the managers felt that concerns about 'Big Brother' and 'spies in the sky' were often fuelled by the media and that journalists made "something out of nothing" because it helped to sell newspapers to promote concern amongst the public about encroachments upon civil liberties.

Conversely, many managers felt the media had served as an ally in the implementation of their CCTV system. A number of schemes had kept the media closely informed about their plans; and surveys carried out by local press, radio and television were reported to have found overwhelming public support. One respondent quoted "100% support", another pointed to "only two letters against". Overall, it was claimed that there had been only a 'handful' of complaints from the 'ordinary public' (as opposed to interested pressure groups, notably Liberty) against the installation and use of CCTV.

5. Responsibility for the installation of the CCTV systems

This issue was addressed primarily in the General Survey with respect to street installations, where individuals were asked who they thought should be allowed to make decisions about putting in CCTV. Table 3 summarises the results. Although the police and local council appear to have overwhelming public endorsement in this regard, a substantial number of respondents provided caveats to their answers relating to the reasons why CCTV was installed, and how it was going to be used. For example, for crime control, the police, and for traffic control, the local council are each acceptable as the regulating body.

Table 3 Public opinion on who should/ should not be allowed to make decisions to install CCTV in public places

	•Should be allowed	Should not be allowed	Don't know
Local council	609(77%)	167(21%)	15(2%)
Police	584(74%)	198(25%)	8(1%)
Local shopkeepers	506(63%)	274(35%)	9(1%)
Neighbourhood watch	421 (53%)	344 (43%)	26 (3%)
Magistrates and courts	371 (47%)	389 (49%)	31 (4%)
Government	346(44%)	429(54%)	16(2%)
Private security firms	303 (38%)	463 (58%)	26 (3%)

1. Respondents were provided with the list of possible decision makers
2. Total number of respondents = 798, reported frequencies exclude missing data

Furthermore, many stated that no single body should make a decision about installation, but it should be made jointly, e.g., by police plus local council plus neighbourhood watch. These respondents only said "yes, should be allowed" to each of these bodies on that condition. The idea of some form of consortium acting in a regulatory capacity was also endorsed by those in the site specific surveys who expressed worries about the use of CCTV.

In terms of who should not be allowed to make a decision about putting CCTV cameras into city streets, two sets of people were identified by more than half of the respondents: private security firms (58%) and the government (54%). Private security firms were seen as not having jurisdiction over public streets although they might reasonably be seen to have some in, for example, private shopping malls - several participants in the Group Discussions raised the point that, even in private places, they should be "vetted and monitored" by the police. The 'government' was interpreted as a distant, rather amorphous power compared to local government "which is concerned with local need". Some of the group participants also felt that local knowledge was important in terms of both civil liberties ("local people should have a say") and effectiveness issues ("... they know where CCTV would be best placed").

Finally, the need for public consultation was raised within each of the Group Discussions. Many participants felt that CCTV is a public issue and therefore there is a need to make the public more aware and provide an opportunity for public debate. The youth groups argued for the need for full public debate - not just restricted to "white, middle-aged, middle class do-gooders". This was particularly stressed where CCTV was introduced into public places such as parks or streets as opposed to private sites and businesses - although many participants still thought that the general public should be informed wherever cameras are installed.

In over a quarter of the schemes studied, the decision to install CCTV had apparently been taken unilaterally by the owners. For most managers issues relating to the decision-making component of implementing CCTV were found to be more to do with the technical aspects of system installation and its potential effectiveness, than with social or inter-agency procedural issues.

In the majority of schemes other agencies were involved in the decision making process but these were usually restricted to the local authority, those shopkeepers who were likely to be affected (often represented by the relevant section of the Chamber of Trade or Commerce), private technical consultants and, predictably, the police. Given that crime control objectives featured in most schemes, formal police involvement was not as widespread as one might have expected, although many schemes had been established with at least the tacit approval of the police. In half of the schemes, however, it was claimed that the police had played no formal part at all in dialogue about the installation or use of the CCTV system.

Private developers in particular believed it was their prerogative to take decisions which would be to the advantage of their 'constituency' - retail outlets and, through them, the purchasing public. It was acknowledged, however, that this 'go-it-alone' attitude had not always been productive and three private schemes conceded that guidelines relating to installation and consultation with other agencies would 'probably' have been helpful, particularly prior liaison with the police.

6. Access to tapes and their subsequent use

View of the public on access to and use of tapes

The highest endorsement for who should have access to the tapes was given for the police (93%) followed by magistrates and courts (83%). Respondents were split approximately 50:50 in their opinions on whether the other bodies listed should have access, and many of the answers were subject to caveats, such as, access would depend on the avowed purposes of an installation. Many group participants felt strongly that only the police should have access and that security personnel should not, nor, more importantly, should the latter select what was to be taped/wiped.

Unexpectedly, 48% of those responding to the General Survey said they thought the general public should have access, but further investigation revealed that for some this referred to any member of the general public and for others it meant any member of the general public who had been recorded on that particular tape. A number of the group participants confirmed the view that if anyone is recorded on a tape which could be used against them in any way, then they had a right to view it. An additional 'good practice' point raised in the Group Discussions was the need for regulations regarding how long tape recordings can be kept before they are destroyed.

Ways in which managers governed the use of CCTV tapes

Four schemes of the thirty examined had no recording facilities. Those which did had very variable levels of recording capability, from 24-hour multiplexed automatic recording to single camera manual recording. The quality of these recordings also varied considerably: some were reported to have little value beyond offering additional assistance in investigating incidents whilst others provided clear time/date 'evidence' admissible in court.

Of more importance, particularly given public concerns about the potential abuse of CCTV tape recordings, is the tape retention period. This varied enormously, from one day to three months, though typically it was between one and two weeks. Decisions about a 'suitable' tape retention period had been based largely on pragmatic considerations such as storage space for tapes, or some loose sense of 'reasonableness', rather than any thought-through response to broader social concerns.

All schemes made exceptions to their 'normal' tape retention period, primarily when the police requested them to do so in relation to a specific criminal offence, but sometimes also regarding "any incident which may have repercussions".

The vast majority of schemes co-operated fully with the police, at various levels of formality, but they had quite different regulations governing police access and use of taped material. Only one (private) scheme claimed that the police had no official access to its recordings. Many other schemes maintained that, for example, "police

requests are always complied with", that "the police are given unlimited access", and that the police could have access to "anything of use to them". Only a minority of schemes had a more regulated, though not necessarily more restrictive, set of procedures concerning police access to tapes. For example, in two cases the police viewed tapes by invitation and, if it was felt they would assist in criminal investigation, copies were made and given to the police. In rather more schemes a police officer of senior rank was expected to make a formal request to a nominated officer of the company or authority, giving reasons why they wished to view particular tapes. If the scheme granted permission for access (and there was no evidence of refusals), the police had to sign for and later return the tape. These regulations were more likely to be effected in local authority' schemes.

Scheme managers were generally adamant that no one other than the police had access to video tape recordings. The few exceptions permitted access to senior personnel from the company or authority responsible for operating the scheme. In three (private) schemes, tenants paying a service charge, and thereby paying for the scheme, were allowed to view tape recordings if they made a good argument for doing so - e.g., to identify a suspected shoplifter or investigate vandalism which had taken place. Only one scheme conveyed vaguely that any request for access "would be dealt with on its merits". In fact, very few schemes had received any requests for access to tape recordings apart from those from the police.

7. Perceived purpose of CCTV systems

Public perceptions of the purpose of CCTV systems

When asked in the General Survey about the purposes for which CCTV was used, most respondents' first reactions were expressed in very general terms, e.g., "to record happenings" and many were unable to be more specific. As a result the top three free responses were very broad descriptors: "security purposes", i.e. to stop any potential trouble (37%); "prevent crime" (28%); and "general surveillance" (18%). There were, however, some more specific responses from one or two people and these included: "to prevent terrorists from planting bombs"; "to stop drug dealing in alleyways"; and, "to prevent people taking part in demos". In addition, 18% of those interviewed were unwilling/unable to provide any free response and appeared to have no idea about the purposes of CCTV without being prompted.

When provided with a list of possible reasons for the use of CCTV, the majority of General Survey respondents endorsed the detection of crime, prevention of crime and safety of the general public. However, the possibility of it being used in a negative way was acknowledged by a substantial number of respondents who endorsed the item: "to spy on people". Table 4 summarises the results.

Table 4 Public perception of the possible uses of CCTV

	Yes	Probably	No	n/K
To catch criminals	731 (92%)	40 (5%)	21 (3%)	6 (1%)
To scare off potential offenders	627 (79%)	68 (8%)	99 (12%)	3 (0.5%)
To make people feel safe	456 (57%)	64 (8%)	261 (33%)	14 (2%)
To stop trouble	452 (57%)	93 (12%)	237 (30%)	11 (2%)
To check up on the general public	313 (39%)	97 (12%)	367 (46%)	21 (3%)
To spy on people	258 (32%)	69 (9%)	458 (57%)	13 (2%)

Note 1: Respondents were provided with the list of possible uses

Note 2: Total number of respondents = 798, reported frequencies exclude missing data

Ways in which managers use CCTV systems

Crime prevention objectives featured strongly in the primary aims which had led to the establishment of CCTV, but it was not always the dominant rationale. Three other factors were also identified as major objectives: the reassurance of the public ('public safety'); the promotion of security ("additional back-up for our on-site

security"); and, efficient management ("adding to our options in the management of the centre"). Site management objectives were claimed as the paramount rationale for CCTV installation on three of the four case study sites; crime prevention was the dominant aim of the other. Crime detection, it should be noted, was not indicated as a major objective. This is a clear mis-match between the aims of managers and the perceptions of the public.

What remains unclear, is whether 'public safety' goals were motivated by public interest or by private sector commercial interests. For example, both private retail developments and local authorities saw safe shopping environments and car parking provision as a fundamental prerequisite to commercial success and local economic prosperity:

"this is a popular centre...and one reason for that is that we're offering people a safe and secure environment to shop in".

Interviews with key individuals from the case study sites revealed that CCTV was considered to be an important mechanism for simultaneously reassuring the consuming public and controlling "the more rowdy element". For example, the managers in one case study felt that elderly people were attracted to the shopping centre because there were no groups of young men "hanging about". Guidelines expressly permitted the moving on of perceived "wines, tramps, youths in gangs, and loiterers", using humour and social skills where possible, rather than force. Other respondents were more reticent in discussing this use of CCTV although one described the primary aim of CCTV as "to combat the problem of youths and drunks".

Of greater significance for the case study CCTV managers of the shopping centre and car park sites were the other functions to which CCTV could be put. Indeed, the manager of the shopping centre site reported how they completely missed a 'smash and grab' raid because the monitors were trained on goods deliveries.

8. Perceived effectiveness of CCTV systems

Public perceptions of effectiveness

Table 5 summarises the perceptions of respondents in the General Survey with regard to the effectiveness of CCTV on crime detection, crime prevention and making people feel safer.

Notably, crime detection yielded a higher proportion of respondents who thought it was 'very effective' than did either of the other two. One factor in this result may be the effect of programmes such as CrimeWatch which highlight the potential for CCTV to be used effectively in crime detection situations. However, this result is in contrast to the findings from the Site Specific Surveys, where crime prevention rather than detection was seen as the prime reason for any perceived impact of CCTV on crime.

Table 5. Perceived effectiveness of CCTV on crime detection, crime prevention and personal safety

	Very effective	Quite effective	Not very effective	Not effective	D/K
Crime detection	150 (19%)	441 (55%)	154 (19%)	19 (2%)	34 (4%)
Crime prevention	104 (13%)	389 (49%)	213 (27%)	69 (9%)	22 (3%)
Making people feel safe	94 (12%)	323 (41%)	202 (25%)	162 (20%)	15 (2%)

1. Total number of respondents = 798, reported frequencies exclude missing data

Some explanation for these differences is provided in the qualitative data collected from the Group Discussions which highlighted the complexity of the issues involved in people's perception of 'detection' effects and of 'deterrent' effects.

CCTV role in crime detection

Many respondents in both survey interviews and the group discussions felt CCTV would only work in crime detection if hidden systems are used (otherwise crime will simply be displaced to other areas), and if the picture/video recording is of high quality. Some felt that picture quality was so poor that identification of perpetrators was "a joke", and the record of CCTV recordings being used effectively in court cases was not encouraging.

CCTV role in crime deterrence

In contrast, CCTV was only felt to act as a deterrent to crime if the systems were well-publicised and the results of prosecutions through the use of CCTV used as part

of the publicity - "otherwise people will think it doesn't matter if the camera sees them anyway". However, many participants felt that those "with a strong criminal intent" will find a way around the cameras and it may even encourage some people "rowdy teenagers showing off to each other". Also some felt that many criminals 'don't care': "they still rob building societies in full view of the cameras" and "if you are drunk at night you don't think about cameras in the street".

A particularly clear finding from the General Survey related to the differing views of those who were relatively pro- or anti-CCTV in respect of civil liberties implications. The attitude scale revealed that those with greater concerns about CCTV believed it was less effective in both detecting and deterring crime.

Levels of perceived effectiveness in respect of known installations

Overall, respondents in the site specific surveys were positive about the potential effect of CCTV on crime. When asked about their perception of the impact of CCTV on the incidence of six 'site specific crimes', on average only around 24% in the shopping centre survey said it would make no difference at all and the equivalent averages from the Car Park and Street Survey data were even lower (15% and 20% respectively). The notable exception was 'disorderliness and rowdy behaviour' with around 45% of respondents in car parks and shopping centre sites saying CCTV would make no difference because 'they will do it anyway'. Similarly, 72% from the street site surveys thought that CCTV would make no difference to 'drunken disorderliness'.

There were some significant differences in the perceived effectiveness of CCTV in respect of with vs. without sites. These findings are the most complex to interpret. The principal with/without effects are as follows: respondents from the street site with a relatively newly established CCTV system thought that CCTV was less likely to make a difference to two of the six crimes. These were 'drunken disorderliness' and 'violent attacks on people'. They were also more likely to say that CCTV will not have an impact on any of the six crimes because criminals "will do it anyway". This difference cannot be attributed to perceived frequency of incidents because there was no significant variation here between sites.

With regard to the Shopping Centre Survey, significantly more respondents in the site without CCTV thought that it could make a difference to the incidence of four of the six crimes listed - by 'scaring off criminals'. Once again, this was unrelated to perceived frequency of incidents.

On a more general note, discussion from the group sessions indicated very clearly that the public perceive CCTV to be potentially effective in some places - particularly small, unprotected places such as subways. However, it was felt to be less effective in, for example, street locations, unless there was a complete network of cameras covering side roads/alleyways, where sexual assaults and muggings were more likely to take place.

Levels of perceived effectiveness in respect of particular types of crime

Four of the six crimes/disorders discussed in each of the site surveys were common to all three sites. A rank order of these four in terms of the number of respondents who thought CCTV would make "a lot" of difference to the incidence of that crime yields the following: violent/physical attack (highest impact); vandalism; theft from a person; and, drunken disorderliness/rowdy behaviour (lowest impact). This ordering generally held true for each of the three sites.

In all cases where respondents thought that CCTV would make a difference, the main reason given was that they felt it would "scare criminals away" although a minority thought that CCTV would "help catch criminals". However, this balance between the deterrent and detection impact of CCTV did differ between crimes, even though the deterrent element was always highest. This suggests that where CCTV does, for example, help catch criminals, the public believe that it will work better for some types of crime rather than others. This is made clear through the following rank order of the 'street crimes' by the perceived reasons for the effectiveness of CCTV. See Table 6.

Table 6. Rank ordering of the perceived impact of CCTV on crime and disorder

CCTV as deterrent	CCTV as detection
1. shop break-in (most effect)	1. violent attacks (most effect)
2. sexual assault	2. theft from a person
3. violent attack	3. vandalism
4. vandalism	4. sexual assaults
5. theft from a person	5. shop break-in
6. drunken disorderliness	6. drunken disorderliness

Of particular interest is the close correspondence between this rank order and those generated by the shopping centre and car park surveys. For violent crimes and vandalism, respondents from all sites suggested that such crimes could not be carried out quickly, and that any potential criminal would therefore judge that there was too much risk of being seen by someone monitoring the camera or being identified at a later stage on videotape. In contrast, respondents suggested that theft from a person was something which could be done fairly surreptitiously (e.g., the work of a pick-pocket) and therefore a potential criminal was likely to judge that the chance of being picked up by CCTV was minimal. These findings were supported by data from the group discussions which also addressed the issue of the differential effect of CCTV on

Perceived effectiveness of CCTV and feelings of personal safety

The impact of CCTV on personal safety is an important issue in its own right. Respondents may argue for effectiveness in respect of impact on crime, yet feel no enhancement of their own personal safety, or vice versa.

First of all, it is important to note that none of the respondents said that the installation of CCTV would make them feel less safe. In fact an appreciable number indicated that CCTV would make them feel safer. The impact of CCTV was reportedly greater in car parks, for both day (58% feel safer) and night (62% feel safer). The corresponding figures for streets was 35% day, and 48% night; and that for shopping centres was 48% for days only.

Older respondents suggested that CCTV has/or would have a relatively high impact on their feelings of safety, and it is this group that also reported feeling less safe than younger respondents. Consistent with this, the night time respondents reported that CCTV would have a relatively small impact on their feelings of safety, and it is this group that reported significantly higher feelings of safety during both day and night. In contrast, although females, compared to males, report lower feelings of safety, there were no significant sex differences in respect of the reported impact of CCTV. One explanation of this lack of difference is to be found in the observation made by some female group members that CCTV would have greatest impact on minor crime, rather than crimes like sexual assault.

Also of interest is the significant relationship between perceptions of current levels of personal safety and the perceived impact of CCTV. The lower the level of perceived personal safety during the day, the higher was the perceived impact of CCTV for increasing levels of safety. However, this relationship did not hold for respondents experience of safety at night time.

Finally, those who were relatively anti-CCTV in respect of civil liberties implications (based on the General Survey attitude measure) felt that CCTV was relatively less helpful in respect of making people feel safe. This is consistent with the views of such persons in respect of the perceived effectiveness of CCTV in detection and deterrence of crime.

Managers' perceptions of effectiveness

Given the diverse objectives attached to the use of CCTV, there is no single criterion of its effectiveness. Managers were asked about the criteria on which they felt the effectiveness of CCTV should be judged and whether or not their scheme had proved to be effective in these terms. They were also asked to provide hard evidence of effectiveness if it was available. Respondents were found to use both 'input' and 'output' criteria.

Input criteria

Respondents from two schemes judged the value of CCTV in terms of the increased security opportunities it provided - the physical area covered (simply not feasible to be carried out by security staff on the ground) and the clarity of pictures (to assist in taking appropriate action). Three schemes suggested, similarly, that the value of CCTV lay in its offering an additional tool for taking effective security measures.

Output criteria

Respondents emphasised crime prevention (through deterrence) and detection. The amorphous concept of 'public reassurance' was also cited as a measure of effectiveness.

An independent analysis by the research team of CCTV 'logs' and crime figures in the case study locations did not allow any clear inference as to the impact of CCTV.

For two-thirds of the schemes, managers were willing to offer a judgment on the effectiveness of CCTV based on their criteria. In only two cases were these judgments negative (these related to poor technical capabilities of the system), and for the other eighteen schemes judgments ranged from 'reasonably' to 'extremely' effective - with a greater cluster of respondents at the more positive end.

Most schemes drew attention to a reduction in shoplifting, car theft, vandalism, public order and other offences though, unlike the following respondent, few offered any 'hard' evidence for such assertions:

"Yes. Glass replacement costs reduced by about £25,000 p.a.
Housebreaking incidence negligible. Recordings have been used by the police 26 times during last 9 months".

Some felt that CCTV had been helpful in deterring "undesirables" and others claimed it had provided public reassurance of "a safe and secure environment" and had reduced fear of crime. Some feedback of effectiveness on these criteria was reported by respondents to have come through informal and unsolicited comments from members of the public.

Managers of shopping centre sites frequently made reference to the effectiveness of CCTV in terms of general management as opposed to security needs. For example, monitoring traffic flow in the public car parks, or monitoring deliveries and other distribution related activities. Indeed of the nine monitors in use in the shopping centre case study site typically only one was used to track the movement of the general public. Such examples of the wider management function of CCTV led a number of managers to comment on the cost effectiveness of CCTV in respect of its saving on staff costs.

However, a number of respondents argued either that it was "too early to say" how effective CCTV had been, or acknowledged the difficulty in making any conclusive judgment in view of other factors at play. In one scheme there was a belief, for example, that there had been a significant reduction in vandalism since the installation of CCTV but the respondent could not attribute this with any confidence to CCTV since security gates had been fitted at the same time. Other respondents proffered similar arguments:

"Very difficult to quantify. I think we can safely say that customer flow has increased since CCTV was installed, but during that time the shopping area has also been

refurbished so we can't say for certain that is down to CCTV. On the other hand, if we didn't have CCTV...?"

9. Conclusions

Currently, CCTV has a broadly positive reception from members of the general public. Levels of concern are not high and CCTV is assumed to be effective in crime control. However, public acceptance is based on limited, and partly inaccurate knowledge of the functions and capabilities of CCTV systems in public places. There may be a need for guidelines that will make possible an informed public acceptance of CCTV through fuller consultation and the provision of information. There is also a need to encourage operational procedures that will maximise the effectiveness of CCTV and minimise any threat to civil liberties which may arise from either sloppy practice or the deliberate misuse of such systems. Any guidelines must anticipate future problems due to the proliferation of CCTV systems, and the pace of technological development which allows increasingly powerful forms of surveillance.

Appendix A: Survey Sampling

General Survey of Public Attitudes

This was designed to measure (i) respondents' awareness of CCTV and their perceptions of its purposes and capabilities; and (ii) the acceptability of CCTV and any public concern in respect of implications for civil liberties.

The general survey data were collected from a sample of the general public in Cardiff (n=200), Bristol (n=200), Birmingham (n=200) and Coventry (n=198). The total sample size for the General Survey of Public Attitudes was therefore n=798.

Survey of Specific Sites

These were designed to measure (i) respondents' perceptions of the impact of CCTV on site relevant crimes; and (ii) the extent to which a CCTV installation or proposed installation would have an effect on their own feelings of safety and possible fear of

The site specific survey data were collected from four sites with a CCTV installation, and three sites without a CCTV installation. The sites with CCTV were chosen because they represented particular forms of developing and implementing CCTV in public places. Street sites received most research attention because it is here that civil liberties implications are likely to be more pronounced. The numbers sampled by site are as follows:

- i. Town Centre streets: a relatively well established local authority-led scheme (n=305)
- ii. Town Centre streets: a relatively newly established police-led scheme (n=247)
- iii. Shopping centre private sector scheme (n=299)
- iv. Car park private sector scheme (n=201)

The numbers sampled for the sites without a CCTV installation were as follows: shopping centre (n=287), car park (n=201) and town centre street (n=239 plus 60 night time interviews)

The total sample size for the Site Specific Surveys was therefore n=1839. In the street site without CCTV, 60 of the interviews were carried out at night in order to increase the range of users contacted.

A basic quota sampling frame was used for each of the surveys in each of the sites, stratified for age, race and sex. Some minor adjustments were made to reflect local differences and thereby increase the representativeness of the survey.

Appendix B: General Survey Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION: We are carrying out an independent project for the Home Office on the use of Close Circuit Television Cameras in public places. We wish to know what people think of these cameras.

1. Where have you seen or been aware of such cameras?

Allow free response/s first, code order of response, then prompt

	Free response		Prompt	
A. in shops	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
B. in a car park	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
C. in a city street	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
D. in a public building	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
E. in a subway	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
F. on a housing estate	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
G. in a bank/building society	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
H. in a shopping centre	Yes 1	No 2	DK 3
Other (write)			
			

2. (As you know), these cameras are now being used more and more in public places. For what purposes do you think these cameras are being used:

Allow free response/s first, and write this

.....
Do you think they are used

A) to help catch people who commit a crime there	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4
B) to check up on the general public ...	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4
C) to scare off somebody who might commit a crime there	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4
D) to stop trouble breaking out	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4
E) to make people feel safe	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4
F) to spy on people	Yes 1	Prob 2	No 3	DK 4

3. How effective do you think these cameras are in:

A) catching criminals

- Very Effective 1
- Fairly Effective 2
- Not very Effective 3
- Not effective 4
- Don't Know 5

B) scaring off criminals

- Very Effective 1
- Fairly Effective 2

- Not very Effective 3
- Not effective 4
- Don't Know 5

- C) making people feel safer
- Very Effective 1
 - Fairly Effective 2
 - Not very Effective 3
 - Not effective 4
 - Don't Know 5

4. Obviously, somebody has to make a decision about putting cameras in city streets. Who do you think should be ALLOWED to make this decision?

Allow free response/s first, code order of response, then prompt

(READ EACH ITEM)	Free response		Prompt		DK
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
The local council	5	6	6	7	7
The police	5	6	6	7	7
Local 'neighbourhood watch' groups ..	5	6	6	7	7
The government	5	6	6	7	7
Local shop keepers	5	6	6	7	7
Private security firms	5	6	6	7	7
The magistrates & the courts	5	6	6	7	7

5. Suppose you were forced to make a guess. How many of these cameras would you say:

Read list, allow answer, interviewer code, prompt only if necessary

	None	Some	Most	All	No idea
Can pick up conversation (as well as a picture)?	1	2	3	4	5
Are being watched by someone as the camera transmits the pictures?	1	2	3	4	5
Have television pictures taped on a video?	1	2	3	4	5
Have hidden cameras so that people do not know that they are being watched?	1	2	3	4	5
Can 'see in the dark'?	1	2	3	4	5
Can pick up close-ups of people's faces?	1	2	3	4	5

6. Now (as you know) it is the case that the television pictures are often recorded on video tape. Thinking again about television cameras in city streets, who do you think should be allowed to watch the television recordings – the video-tapes?

(READ EACH ITEM)	Yes	No	DK
The local council	1	2	3
The police	1	2	3
Local 'neighbourhood watch' groups	1	2	3

The government	1	2	3
Local shop keepers	1	2	3
Private security firms	1	2	3
The magistrates and courts	1	2	3
Any member of the general public	1	2	3

7. Now I'd like to read to you some of the things that people have said about these cameras, and I'd like you to say whether you agree or disagree with each sentence.

Prompt: How much do you agree/ disagree etc.

	SA	A	N	D	SD	(DK)
1. People who obey the law have nothing to fear from these cameras	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. These cameras could easily be abused and used by the wrong people	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. It would be Ok to use hidden cameras	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. These cameras are really 'spy cameras' and should be banned	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. People have a right to know whenever they are being watched by a camera	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Only criminals have any reason to be afraid of these cameras	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The more of these cameras we have the better	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. People should always be told by a large notice when such a camera is being used	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. These cameras invade people's privacy	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The people who are in control of these systems can certainly be trusted to use them only for the public good	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. In the future, cameras will be used by the government to control people	1	2	3	4	5	6

Now I should like to ask you about any general concern you may have with respect to crime levels

8. Do you ever worry about the possibility that you or anyone else who lives with you might be the victim of crime?

No 1 (GO TO 9) Yes 2

If YES :

Is this (READ OUT):

A big worry 1 A bit of a worry 2 or Just an occasional doubt? 3

9. How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?

Would you say (READ OUT)

(NOTE : If never alone , probe : 'How safe would you feel ...')
Very safe 1 Fairly safe 2 A bit unsafe 3 or Very unsafe 4

I would like to finish by collecting very brief details about you to help us analyse the results of the survey.

10. Would you mind telling me your job title?
Write

(If not working go to 12)

11. Is that ...
Professional 1
Managerial 2
Skilled 3
Semi-Skilled 4
Unskilled 5 ? GO TO 13

12. If not working ask their previous job title:
Write

Ask if they are:

Unemployed and seeking work 2
Sick or disabled and unable to work 3
Retired 4
Housewife 5
In full-time education 6

13. Would you mind telling me how old you are?
Write

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

14. Interviewer estimate, 'E' if refused to give age
Write.....

15. Interviewer code:
A White 1
B Afro- Caribbean 2
C Asian 3
D Other 4

16. Interviewer code:
Respondent's sex Male 1 Female 2

Appendix C: Site Specific Questionnaire

FOR USE IN STREETS WITH CCTV

INTRODUCTION. We are carrying out an independent project for the Home Office and I would like to ask you some questions about crime in this area.

1. Firstly, thinking about this particular street please tell me how often, you think, each of the following crimes is likely to happen in the next month.

Allow answer, interviewer code, prompt only if necessary

- 1 VERY OFTEN
- 2 FAIRLY OFTEN
- 3 OCCASIONALLY
- 4 RARELY
- 5 NOT AT ALL
- 6 DON'T KNOW

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments (write)
A) A violent attack on somebody	1	2	3	4	5	6	
B) An act of vandalism	1	2	3	4	5	6	
C) Drunken disorderliness	1	2	3	4	5	6	
D) Theft from a person	1	2	3	4	5	6	
E) A sexual assault (physical)	1	2	3	4	5	6	
F) A shop break-in	1	2	3	4	5	6	

2. You might have noticed that in some public places there are now cameras there to watch what is going on. Have you noticed any cameras in this street?

YES 1 (do not circle yes if the respondent notices the camera, for the first time, while the question is being asked.)

NO 2

DON'T KNOW 3

Inform respondent that there are cameras here.

3. One of the reasons for these cameras is to cut down on crime. Thinking about the cameras in this street, how much, if at all, do you think they reduce the amount of:

1. A LOT 2. SOMEWHAT 3. A LITTLE 4. NOT AT ALL 5. DON'T KNOW

1 SCARES AWAY CRIMINAL (DETERRENT)

2 HELPS CATCH CRIMINALS

3 CRIMINALS WILL DO IT ANYWAY

4 DON'T KNOW

N.B. If respondent says they make no difference, because cameras are hidden, write this for each item.

A) Violent attacks on people 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

B) Acts of vandalism 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

C) Drunken disorderliness 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

D) Theft from people 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

E) Sexual assaults (physical) 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

F) Shop break-ins 1 2 3 4 5 1 2 3 4

Now ask why it would/would not reduce this
(code free response & write other)

I should now like to ask you about any general concern you may have with respect to crime levels.

4. Do you ever worry about the possibility that you or anyone else who lives with you might be the victim of crime?

No 1 (GO TO 5)

Yes 2 Is this (READ OUT):

A big worry 1 A bit of a worry 2 or Just an occasional doubt? 3

5. Are there any areas of this city where you would feel unsafe if you were walking alone there after dark?

(READ OUT)

None 1 A few 2 Many 3 All 4

6. How about during the day?

(READ OUT)

None 1 A few 2 Many 3 All 4

7. Thinking about possible trouble that could take place, how safe do you feel walking through THIS street alone after dark?

Very safe 1 Safe 2 A bit unsafe 3 Very unsafe 4

8. How about during the day?

Very safe 1 Safe 2 A bit unsafe 3 Very unsafe 4

9. Does the fact that this street is covered by television Cameras make any difference to how safe you feel after dark?

- Much more safe 1
- A little bit more safe 2
- Just as safe or unsafe (etc.) 3
- Don't know 4

10. Does this make any difference to how safe you feel during the day?

- Much more safe 1
- A little bit more safe 2
- Just as safe or unsafe (etc.) 3
- Don't know 4

11. So far we have talked about the impact of these cameras on crime and disorder. Now I'd like to talk about possible concerns over their use. Some people have some worries about these cameras. Do you have some worries about them here?

- SOME 1
- NO 2(GO TO 12)
- DK 3

IF SOME write free response

.....
.....

IF SOME prompt whether the worry is:

- A. A worry in principle
- B. Depends on who controls CCTV.
- (If neither write worry at C.)

A. Worry in principle (write):

.....
.....

B. Worry depends on who controls CCTV (write):

.....
.....

C. Other (write):

.....
.....

12. Would you have any worries about these cameras being in other places?

- YES 1 If YES ask where
- NO 2 GO TO 13
- DK 3

Places where they would have worries about CCTV
(write)

.....

13. Overall, do you welcome or not welcome the presence of CCTV in this street?

- Very welcome 1
- Welcome 2
- Neither welcome nor unwelcome 3
- Unwelcome 4
- Very unwelcome 5
- DK 6

I would like to finish by collecting very brief details about you to help us analyse the results of the survey.

14. Would you mind telling me your job title?

Write
(If not working go to 16)

15. Is that...

- Professional 1
- Managerial 2
- Skilled 3
- Semi-Skilled 4
- Unskilled 5 GO TO 17

16. If not working ask their previous job title

Write

Ask if they are:

- Unemployed and seeking work 2
- Sick or disabled and unable to work 3
- Retired 4
- Housewife 5
- In full-time education 6

17. Would you mind telling me how old you are?

Write.....

18. How often do you visit this street?

- More than once a week 1
- Once a week 2
- Once a month 3
- Less than once a month4

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

Interviewer estimates as per final page of the General Survey Questionnaire

Appendix D: Group Discussions

The purpose of the group Discussions was to explore issues raised in the general survey and the site specific survey in more detail. The groups, identified by the researchers in conjunction with Home Office advisors and consultations with representatives from Liberty were as follows:

Asian: male and female under 20 years. Black: male and female under 20 years. White: male and female under 20 years. Mixed race: male and female 20 - 29 years. Mixed race: male and female 30 - 59 years. Mixed race: male and female 60+ years. Female: mixed race 20 - 39 years. Students active in student politics: mixed race male and female with mixed political affiliations.

Each group was asked about both fear of crime and civil liberties issues, but the focus of the discussion depended upon the concerns of the group in question. Each session was run by two research workers (one of who was of the same ethnic origin as group members) to optimise the quality of discussion generated and information recorded. Where appropriate, the sessions were also tape-recorded to provide 'back-up' information. Within each group discussion, the following areas were covered:

- i. Introduction to CCTV systems - what they are and why they are used. Identification of level of awareness of CCTV systems of group participants,
- ii. Group participants' perceptions of effectiveness of CCTV systems in controlling crime; comparisons (e.g., better lighting, private security, more police 'on the beat'),
- iii. Discussion about who should be allowed to make decisions regarding the installation of CCTV systems and who should be allowed to have access to the information from them (e.g., video tapes).
- iv. Discussion on civil liberties issues based on the following statements from the Thurstone Scale used in the general survey.
 - people who obey the law have nothing to fear from these cameras
 - z these cameras could easily be abused and used by the wrong people
 - it would be OK to use hidden cameras
 - these cameras invade people's privacy
 - in the future, cameras will be used by the government to control people.
- v. Discussion on participants' fears about crime, with particular reference to the ways in which any such fear affects their behaviour.
- vi. Discussion on whether there should be a limit to the use of CCTV systems.

Appendix E: The Case Studies

Four CCTV sites were selected for case studies in order to illuminate and expand on issues emerging from the CCTV manager survey. These sites were chosen, with advice from the Home Office, not only because they reflected the key contexts for the study of CCTV (town centres, shopping centres and car parks) but because they represented particular forms of developing and implementing CCTV in public places. The case study schemes therefore had the following characteristics:

- Town Centre streets: local authority-led scheme
- Town Centre streets: police-led scheme
- Shopping centre: private sector scheme
- Car park: private sector scheme

Each of these schemes had quite different organisational and operational characteristics. Not all had the same forms of staffing and management and therefore the intention to 'target' specific categories of respondents on each site required modification. Targeted respondents fell broadly into five categories:

- Scheme management (including senior security personnel)
- Security staff
- Police (who liaised with the scheme)
- Shopkeepers (in town centre and shopping centre schemes)
- 'Deviants' (drunks and youths who might be 'victims' of CCTV)

The objective of the case study work was to examine the operation and effectiveness of CCTV from a range of perspectives, thereby building up on the data from the telephone and questionnaire survey of user managers. Discussions with scheme management largely followed the framework of the user questionnaire, but allowed for a deeper probing of the issues. Interviews with the police focused more firmly on the issue of police relationship with the scheme, particularly access to videotape recordings and other procedural regulations. Interviews with shopkeepers and 'deviants' concentrated on awareness of CCTV and any influence CCTV may have had on behaviour.

Appendix F: Construction of the attitude scales

Thurstone attitude scales were established for three dimensions

- i) 'Favourability of attitudes to CCTV vs. Concern about civil liberties aspects of CCTV
- ii) 'Fear of Crime'
- iii) 'Effect of street crime on quality of life'

Each was subjected to appropriate statistical scrutiny part of which is illustrated below with respect to the first dimension. The Favourability vs. Concern about CCTV Thurstone scale proved to have excellent psychometric properties, and formed an important part of the data analysis of the General Survey. In contrast, the 'Fear of Crime' and 'Effects of street crime on quality of life' scales were given only to the car park sample and the statistical analysis indicated that although the scales were most promising more development was required. Hence, these scales are not described in this report.

Construction of the Favourability vs. Concern about CCTV Scale

i. Eight members of the project team generated items that seemed to tap the relevant dimension, i.e. favourability of attitude to CCTV (with special reference to civil liberties concerns). This yielded an initial pool of over 80 items. A panel of three people evaluated these items, eliminating those which overlapped or were judged to be obviously inappropriate or ambiguous.

ii. The remaining 32 items were carefully edited by the small team, and the final version was cast into a questionnaire form for judges.

iii. Ten Judges were asked to indicate, on a scale from -5 to +5, how FAVOURABLE or UNFAVOURABLE each of the 32 statements was towards the use of CCTV. They were requested not to let their own attitudes towards CCTV influence this judgment. The scale used ranged from -5, indicating EXTREME UNFAVOURABILITY towards CCTV, to +5, indicating EXTREME FAVOURABILITY.

iv. 'Usable' statements were then selected for inclusion into the final version of an instrument to be given to subjects. 'Usability' here refers to statements which the judges rated with a relatively high consensus. Of the 'usable' statements, a selection of 11 was made, reflecting a range of mean rated values across the scale. Thus the final scale included some extremely and some moderately favorable items, and some extremely and some moderately unfavorable items. The final version can be seen in the General Survey questionnaire.

Statistical treatment of the 'Favourability vs. Concern' Thurstone

i. The MEANS of the JUDGES' ratings were used as weightings. The questionnaire items were initially coded using a 1 - 5 scale. To calculate the Thurstone score (the variable POSCCTV) these codings were multiplied by the weighting. A negative value for the rating reflected a favourable attitude towards CCTV.

ii. Means and standard deviations of the Thurstone scores:

Mean -10.40 Std Dev 23.11

Minimum -65.90

Maximum 64.80 (Valid Cases 764)

iii. Item analysis : Each of the variables that contributed to the overall Thurstone score (POSCCTV) was correlated with a form of POSCCTV in which the item itself was omitted. The resulting correlations ranged between -.20 and +.58. In each case the correlation was highly significant and the valency of the correlation was in the predicted direction (i.e. it matched the valency previously assigned on the basis of the JUDGES' ratings).

iv. Factor Analysis: It is important to note that the first factor (accounting for 35% of the variance) is highly correlated with each of the items ($r > .5$ in all except one case) and that in every case the valency is the same as that assigned previously on the basis of the JUDGES' ratings. This is interpreted to mean that the first factor identified is that which was 'given' to (and used by) judges. On this basis it seems reasonable to assign to the major factor the label/description given to the judges - i.e. favourability towards CCTV. Thus the factor analysis can be regarded as providing a partial validation of the instrument.

v. Reliability: A split-half reliability was calculated by computing two scores THURSA and THURSB from items 1 - 5 and 6 - 11 of the original 11-item Thurstone, and then correlating these new variables. Considering that very few items are included in either composite variable, the correlation of +.62 can be considered high, and suggests that what is being measured by the instrument is being measured reliably.

vi. From the frequency data relating to POSCCTV it was possible to split the population into three groups of approximately equal numbers. The crosstabulation analyses relating to POSCCTV employed this breakdown. Obviously much information is lost in this simple categorization, but the POSCCTV variable is retained in its more subtle form for future analyses.

Police Research Group Crime Prevention Unit Series

1. **Reducing Burglary: a study of chemists' shops.** Gloria Laycock. 1985. v+7pp. (0 86353 154 8).
2. **Reducing Crime: developing the role of crime prevention panels.** Lorna J. F. Smith and Gloria Laycock. 1985. v+14pp. (0 86252 189 0).
3. **Property Marking: a deterrent to domestic burglary?** Gloria Laycock. 1985. v+25pp. (0 86252 193 9).
4. **Designing for Car Security: towards a crime free car.** Dean Southall and Paul Ekblom. 1986. v+25pp. (0 86252 222 6).
5. **The Prevention of Shop Theft: an approach through crime analysis.** Paul Ekblom. v+19pp. (0 86252 237 4).
6. **Prepayment Coin Meters: a target for burglary.** Nigel Hill. 1986. v+15pp. (0 86252 245 5).
7. **Crime in Hospitals: diagnosis and prevention.** Lorna J. F. Smith. 1987. v+25pp. (0 86252 267 6).
8. **Preventing Juvenile Crime: the Saffordshire Experience.** Kevin Heal and Gloria Laycock. 1987. v+29pp. (0 86252 297 8).
9. **Preventing Robberies at Sub-Post Offices: an evaluation of a security initiative.** Paul Ekblom. 1987. v+34pp. (0 86252 300 1).
10. **Getting the Best out of Crime Analysis.** Paul Ekblom. 1988. v+38pp. (0 86252 307 8).
11. **Retail Crime: Prevention through Crime Analysis.** John Burrows. 1988. v+30pp. (0 86252 313 3).
12. **Neighbourhood Watch in England and Wales: a locational analysis.** Sohail Husain. 1988. v+63pp. (0 86252 314 1).
13. **The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale.** David Forrester, Mike Chatterton and Ken Pease with the assistance of Robin Brown. 1988. v+34pp. (0 86252 333 8).
14. **The Prevention of Robbery at Building Society Branches.** Claire Austin. 1988. v+18pp. (0 86252 337 0).
15. **Crime Prevention and Racial Harassment in Asian-run Small Shops: the scope for prevention.** Paul Ekblom and Frances Smith with the assistance of Sneh Birdi. 1988. v+54pp. (0 86252 348 6).
16. **Crime and Nuisance in the Shopping Centre: a case study in crime prevention.** Susan Phillips and Raymond Cochrane. 1988. v+32pp. (0 86252 358 3).
17. **The Prevention of Fraud.** Michael Levi. 1988. v+19pp. (0 86252 359 1).
18. **An Evaluation of Domestic Security Surveys.** Gloria Laycock. 1989. v+33pp. (0 86252 408 3).
19. **Downtown Drinkers: the perceptions and fears of the public in a city centre.** Malcolm Ramsey. 1989. v+23pp. (0 86252 419 9).
20. **The Management and Prevention of Juvenile Crime Problems.** Barrymore Cooper. 1989. v+63pp. (0 86252 420 2).

21. **Victim Support and Crime Prevention in an Inner-City Setting.** Alice Sampson and Graham Farrell. 1990. v+27pp. (0 86252 504 7).
22. **Lagerland Lost? An experiment in keeping Drinkers off the street in central Coventry and elsewhere.** Malcolm Ramsey. 1990. v+38pp. (0 86252 520 9).
23. **The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project: Phase II.** David Forrester, Samantha Frenz, Martin O'Connell and Ken Pease. 1990. v+51pp. (0 86252).
24. **Probation Practice in Crime Prevention.** Jane Geraghty. 1991. v+45pp. (0 86252 605 1).
25. **Lessons from a Victim Support Crime Prevention Project.** Alice Sampson. 1991. v+41pp. (0 86252 616 7).
26. **The Prevention of Cheque and Credit Card Fraud.** Michael Levi, Paul Bissell and Tony Richardson. 1991. v+52pp. (0 86252 633 7).
27. **Making Crime Prevention Pay: initiatives from business.** John Burrows. 1991. v+50pp. (0 86252 629 9).
28. **The Influence of Street Lighting on Crime and Fear of Crime.** Stephen Atkins, Sohail Husain and Angele Storey. 1991. v+59pp. (0 86252 668 X).
29. **The Effect of Better Street Lighting on Crime and Fear: a Review.** Malcolm Ramsay with the assistance of Rosemary Newton. 1991. v+48pp. (0 86252 670 1).
30. **Reducing Crime on the London Underground.** Barry Webb and Gloria Laycock. 1992. v+30pp. (0 86252 688 4).
31. **Assessing Crime Prevention Initiatives: The First Steps.** Geoff Berry and Mike Carter. 1992. v+46pp. (0 86252 823 2).
32. **Tackling Car Crime.** Barry Webb and Gloria Laycock. 1992. v+32pp. (0 86252 832 1).
33. **Car Theft in England and Wales: The Home Office Car Theft Index.** George Houghton. 1992. (0 86252 712 0).
34. **Preventing Car Crime in Car Parks.** Barry Webb, Ben Brown and Katherine Bennett. 1992.