Being observed by CCTV
Synthesis report

Eric Töpfer

toepfer@ztg.tu-berlin.de

Centre for Technology and Society, Technical University Berlin
Sekr. P 2-2, Hardenbergstraße 36A, 10623 Berlin, Germany

Zentrum Technik und Gesellschaft

Table of contents

1   Introduction

This is the synthesis report of work package 5 of the URBANEYE project, a comparative study on CCTV in Europe. In the early work packages we have studied the legislation as well as policy and media discourses which frame the diffusion and actual use of CCTV. We have examined the extent, technological sophistication and legality of CCTV systems at the urban level in selected European capitals. Moreover, the orders and practices of visual surveillance were analysed in 40 CCTV systems representing very different purposes and contexts of this particular surveillance technology.

After our main focus so far was the social shaping of technology and its human mediation when once in place, we now change the perspective and ask for its social implications: How is CCTV experienced by those under surveillance and with what impacts for their behaviour? Given the overall objectives of the URBANEYE project to approach the academic question if the proliferation of CCTV represents the extension of the Panopticon as described by the French philosopher Michel Foucault and to help the quest of a policy that balances human rights and legitimate purposes of risk management, two sets of questions are of crucial interest:

- When and under which conditions do people see CCTV as the "friendly eye in the sky" that helps to reduce risks and fear? And when do they see it as an illegitimate disturbance that violates their sense of shame or even infringes their human rights?

- In which contexts and triggered by what mechanisms does CCTV induce – desired or feared – anticipatory conformity? Under which circumstances does CCTV cause other social effects that may be unintended, such as avoidance of monitored locations, ignorance towards an environment for which CCTV operators are believed to be responsible, staging in front of cameras, deliberate provocations or actual resistance against surveillance systems?

To approach these questions we will first summarise and discuss the state of the art in this field of CCTV research. Secondly, we will present the methodology and findings of our own empirical study that compiled opinions of more than 1,000 people about CCTV in Berlin, Budapest, London, Oslo and Vienna. Finally, we will discuss our findings and compare them with earlier studies in order to draw some cautious conclusions about the social implications of CCTV in Europe.

2 CCTV effects: The state of the art

There are two main strands of research on the social implications of CCTV. The first and dominant strand concentrates on the crime impacts of CCTV and to some degree its impacts on the fear of crime. The second major strand addresses the public attitudes towards the use of CCTV. Thus most research was either done on the crime effects of CCTV or on what Koskela (1999) calls the "emotional aspects of surveillance". Research focusing on the effects of CCTV on non-criminal behaviour is just emerging, which in fact is no surprise, when we remember the methodological difficulties to isolate and study the crime effects of CCTV.

Most research on CCTV has concentrated on the question if CCTV is an effective instrument of crime control. As we have presented and discussed the findings of these studies elsewhere (Hempel & Töpfer 2001: 22-31, McCahill & Norris 2002: 15-19) we will only briefly discuss this issue here. The overwhelming majority of high quality evaluations have been carried out in Britain so far. In other European countries CCTV evaluations are underway with only preliminary findings published so far (e.g. Flight & van Heerwaarden 2003). The findings of the evaluations of the crime impacts of CCTV are disparate and not easy to summarise. Welsh and Farrington conclude on the basis of their meta-analysis of 18 CCTV evaluations from Britain and North America:

> "CCTV had a significant desirable effect on crime, although the overall reduction in crime was a very small four per cent." (Welsh & Farrington 2002: 41)

However, half of the reviewed studies show evidence of a desirable effect of CCTV on crime, while the other nine studies show no evidence of any desirable effect. In detail, mixed results were found for the crime prevention effectiveness of CCTV across three settings, i.e. city centre and public housing setting, CCTV in public transportation systems, and CCTV in car parks. Five evaluations of CCTV in the first setting showed small but significant effects on crime, while CCTV had no effect on crime in four other evaluations. A similar picture emerged for CCTV in public transportation systems. Two evaluations found a desirable effect, one found no effect, and one even found an undesirable effect on crime. For CCTV in car parks they found a "statistically significant reduction in crime of about 41 per cent", but cautiously add that in all these cases other crime prevention measures were in operation at the same time (2002: 42). In terms of types of crime affected, Armitage summarises in her review of current CCTV evaluations that "CCTV appears to have no effect on violent crimes, a significant effect on vehicle crimes and it is most effective when used in car parks" (2002: 4).

Ditton and Short (1999), who found similar disparate results in their groundbreaking comparison of the effects of open street CCTV in two adjacent town centres, brought it to the simple formula: "Yes, it works, no, it doesn't." Or, as Armitage concludes more elegantly:

> "CCTV is no panacea. As with all crime reduction measures, it should never be assumed
> that it will reduce crime regardless of considerations for the mechanisms under which it is
> expected to work or the local environment." (Armitage 2002: 6)

Armitage also points out that CCTV appears to have a life cycle contingent upon the maintenance of publicity and even reports that in many cases the effects of CCTV upon crime began before surveillance cameras actually became operational. Thus it becomes clear that when studying how CCTV works, public awareness and opinion are as important as the actual organisation and practice of surveillance, which leads us to the second major strand of research.

Besides the bunch of opinion polls on CCTV that have been ordered by local media or self-interested practitioners in many European countries[1], studies explicitly committed to scientific standards are known from Britain (for an excellent summary see: Phillips 1999), Germany (Reuband 2001, Klocke et.al. 2001, Hölscher 2003) Finland (Koskela & Touminen 2003), the Netherlands (Flight & van Heerwaarden 2003) and Switzerland (Klauser 2004a, 2004b). Though methods and sample structure are unknown, we also include a Gallup Poll survey ordered by the Danish Crime Prevention Council (2000) in our summary of the recent findings, as it is the only survey from Denmark covering more aspects of CCTV from which findings are available in English. Though it is likely that other studies have been done in others countries, we are not aware of them because of our limited language competencies.[2] The only international comparison that we know is the small qualitative study on video surveillance and women's perception of safety in Helsinki and Edinburgh provided by Koskela (1999). In addition, a recent Eurobarometer survey presents helpful findings about the EU citizens´ views on privacy and data protection in general (European Opinion Research Group 2003).

Though most of these studies addressed similar issues their value for a European comparison is limited because of their very different methodological approaches. Ditton (1999) and others reminds us that the methods chosen have a significant impact on the results of research on public attitudes towards CCTV. Different sampling strategies might bias the representation of certain social groups. Personal interviews in street surveys might represent those who actually use the street, while postal interviews of randomly selected respondents might represent the socio-demographic structure of the local residents. As "older women are less likely to resist CCTV than younger men", as Ditton puts it brutally (1999: 222), a significant higher support is likely to be found in studies

---

[1]   The findings of these surveys are mostly limited to a simple pro vs. contra CCTV decision. Further details
      are not available. Thus it seems likely that the question is either raised by professional market research in
      telephone interviews between questions for the next Sunday vote decision and the favourite soft drink,
      or by ad-hoc surveys of journalists who approach – armed with microphones and perhaps TV cameras –
      the visitors of a pedestrian area for an afternoon. Having said this, we see no need to further discuss
      these data.

[2]   It should be noted here that we were only able to include the findings of Koskela & Tuominen (2003)
      and Flight & van Heerwaarden (2000) because the authors themselves provided help.

which employ the latter sampling strategy. Honess and Charman show a gender difference according to the method: While in street surveys males were more critical towards surveillance, it were women who expressed the most concerns in group discussions (quoted in Koskela 1999: 5). Moreover, Ditton (1999: 226) found a 35% difference in public support of CCTV as influenced by questionnaire design. Contextualising questions either pro or contra CCTV before asking for the acceptability of CCTV had a highly significant impact on the results.

However, summarising the results of the research done so far does provide at least some broad ideas about what people think about CCTV in several European countries:

- **A majority supports CCTV.** All known studies found a majority of respondents supporting. CCTV.Honess and Charman report in their 1992 survey in four British towns that 85% would "welcome" a CCTV system (quoted in Phillips 1999: 139). Bennett and Gelsthorpe discovered when surveying the population of Cambridge in 1996 that 64% (N = 716) thought that CCTV was a "good idea" (quoted in Ditton 1999: 227). Ditton (2000) found in an extensive 1994-1996 survey on public attitudes in Glasgow that 67% (N = 3,074) "don´t mind" CCTV and 52% agree with the statement "The more CCTV cameras, the better". However, in his own critique he admits of having made the error of asking contextualising questions before the key questions and notes "if they [the questionnaire effects] are sustained (and at this level) the 67 per cent [of CCTV] in favour would be more realistically set at 47 per cent in favour." (Ditton 2000: 705). The Gallup Poll survey (N = 514) carried out in Denmark in 1999 showed that 60% "favourably disposed towards more CCTV surveillance" (Danish Crime Prevention Council 2000: 12). In Germany a comparative study of citizens´ attitudes found in autumn 2000 that open street CCTV was thought to be "very good" or "good" by 77% (N = 837) in Dresden, the capital of the state Saxonia in East-Germany, and 66% (N = 731) in Düsseldorf, the capital of the state Northrhine-Westphalia in West-Germany (Reuband 2001). Another study in the Saxonian city of Leipzig discovered in summer 2000 that 79% (N = 770) were "very" or "rather" supportive of public area CCTV (Hölscher 2003). Both studies were contextualising their questions for the support of CCTV. This was not the case in a survey among pedestrians (N = 120) in the Bavarian city Regensburg which found in 2000 that 53% of the respondents supported open street CCTV (Klocke et.al. 2001). In the Finland where citizens of Helsinki (N = 1,240) were surveyed in winter 2001, 63% agreed that "it is a good thing that the urban space is surveilled" (Koskela & Tuominen 2003: 125). The evaluation of three schemes in the Dutch city of Amsterdam discovered in a survey of local shop owners, residents and visitors (N = 1,036) that more than 75% thought CCTV is "a good idea" (Flight & van Heerwaarden 2003). In Switzerland Klauser (2004a) found in the city of Olten that 57% of the respondents (N = 487) agree with the statement: "Who has nothing to hide, don´t need to mind CCTV." Though most studies indicate majority support,

their findings should not be overemphasised due to methodological reasons: Most of them were based on quantitative rather than qualitative methods, and, in addition, often framed their key question by fear of crime questions. In contrast, at least two studies suggest that only a tight majority supports CCTV when asked without context, and in her qualitative study on women´s perception of video surveillance (N = 35) Koskela (1999) finds a majority being "ambivalent" ("yes, but" or "no, but") rather than unequivocal supportive – almost all interviewed women in Helsinki and more than a half in Edinburgh.

▪ **A strong minority indicates concerns about CCTV – often on the grounds of civil liberties in general or privacy in particular:** Honess and Charman discovered in four English towns that 8% expressed worries about CCTV and 36% agreed that it does invade privacy. Bennett and Gelsthorpe found that 29% in Cambridge were "very of fairly worried about civil liberties", and Squires and Measor report that 31% (N = 779) in Brighton criticised CCTV on civil liberty grounds (quoted in (quoted in: Phillips 1999: 140, Ditton 2000: 694). In Denmark every fifth respondent to a survey indicated a negative attitude towards the increased use of surveillance cameras (Danish Crime Prevention Council 2000: 12). Being "against" CCTV were found 21% in Leipzig (Hölscher 2003) and 35% in Regensburg (Klocke et.al. 2001). Though in Dresden and Düsseldorf less than 10% thought CCTV to be "bad" or "very bad", between 22% and 30% saw a potential for abuse (Reuband 2001: 7). Interestingly, in Helsinki less than 10% felt their privacy invaded by CCTV surveillance (Koskela & Tuominen 2003: 52). This might be explained to some degree by the fact that people in Finland compared to overall Europe seem to be "not very concerned" about privacy protection in general (European Opinion Research Group 2003: 7).

▪ **Older people, less educated and women more supportive of public area CCTV, while younger people, more educated and men tend to be more critical.** Ditton, for example, reports for Glasgow that 94% of those aged 60 and older "don't mind" CCTV, while this is the case for 62% of those aged 16-34 years. The same survey found that 13% more women than men "don't mind" CCTV (2000: 700). Reuband found margins of 22% (Dresden) and 30% (Düsseldorf) between those aged 60 and older and those aged 18-29 years (2001: 7), and of more than 20% between those with higher education and those who left school early. In contrast, he documents only a slight gender margin with 2% and 5% more women in support of CCTV. In Helsinki nearly 70% of the female respondents who were 50 or older agreed with the statement "that people who have no criminal intentions should have no negative feelings on surveillance", while less than 50% of the males under 30 years did so (Koskela & Tuominen 2003: 53). However, socio-demographic characteristics might be powerful predictors but they are no *explanans* in themselves. They only represent the probability of certain situations, roles, opinions, values and visions that might influence attitudes towards CCTV.

- **Rather than fear of crime it is believe in the effectiveness of CCTV, trust in the state and its police and desire for order and uniformity that makes people supportive of CCTV.** Though some quantitative studies found that a majority of respondents "believed that CCTV was effective in reducing fear of crime" (Phillips 1999: 139, referring to Bennett & Gelsthorpe), Klocke (2001) reports that only ten out of hundred respondents deliberately referred to video surveillance when asked in a qualitative pre-study to talk freely about issues of crime and control. Flight and van Heerwaarden (2003) found in their Amsterdam evaluation that despite majority support of CCTV those surveyed do not expect to feel safer because of CCTV, and no significant improvement in the fear of crime was shown when comparing the two sweeps of surveys. Ditton (2000) demonstrates that, albeit age and gender are relatively powerful predictors of 'minding' about being watched by cameras, this does not reflect anticipated vulnerability: Those who have been a crime victim were even less likely to support CCTV than those who do not worry about being a victim. Koskela (1999) found that most women interviewed in her study consider CCTV to increase safety in general but not personally. Brown concludes that spaces under surveillance "continued to be the spaces which women defined as high risk" as surveillance "cannot change the general intimidation, verbal harassment, staring, and drunken rowdiness amongst groups of men which constraint women's movement most strongly" (Brown 1999: 218). As Ditton puts it, CCTV "is not making the unsafe feel safe; it is making the already safe feel safer" (2000: 702). Multiple regression analyses demonstrate that the level of 'safety feeling' is of minor influence on the attitudes towards CCTV compared to other variables: Hölscher (2003) found the believe in the effectiveness of CCTV in terms of crime and costs, and opinions on civil liberties to be much more influential, and Reuband concludes that opinions on CCTV are much more determined by the fear of "strangers" and the trust in the police and the state. In this context Dutton's remark that the young people interviewed by his team "were in the city to meet 'strangers' with whom perhaps they hope, one day, to be 'safe'" (2000: 707) seems to provide a much better explanation for them being more likely to be critical of CCTV than the allegation that they are less vulnerable than the elderly. Besides the margins in attitudes between different social groups in one place, Reuband (2001) shows in his two-city comparison that among the most influential variables that might shape the opinions on CCTV are the cities themselves. Thus, local cultural values determined by different patterns of socialisation, historical experiences etc. seem to be of uttermost importance when explaining peoples´ opinions on CCTV.

- **Despite their majority support people are rather uninformed about CCTV.** Early studies indicate that only between one third and two third of the population using streets with CCTV actually know that they are under surveillance (Norris & Armstrong 1999: 92, referring to Honess & Charman; Squires & Measor). Ditton, in his Glasgow

survey, found that three months after the installation of CCTV cameras in the city centre "only 33 per cent of those in the city knew cameras were in operation: 15 months after installation, this had only risen to 41 per cent" (2000: 704). Klauser (2004a) shows that a majority of people responding to his survey assume that they are under surveillance in particular types of places but is unable to name particular locations. In addition, he found that only a minority was able to name the locations that were monitored by police cameras. Koskela and Tuominen report "that 71 per cent of respondents thought that the matter had not been discussed at all or sufficiently in the press or on TV" and that "many thought that the public has not been informed properly about surveillance" (2003: 126). Moreover, Norris and Armstrong (1999: 60-88) and McCahill (2002: 52-68) show that media coverage tend to be biased because of a heavy reliance on few representatives of local elites as primary definers and discursive practices aimed at emphasising the positive aspects of CCTV. Klocke et.al. (2001) discovered in Regensburg that – despite an information campaign by the local police and signage – the respondents hardly know anything about the locations of cameras or the details of police surveillance". The authors suggest that instead reflecting on video surveillance people "support cameras because they support cameras", They conclude that CCTV cameras represent an omnipresent observer who socially sorts those under surveillance on the basis of either deviance or conformity. In this context it is interesting, that Short and Ditton (1998) found in their qualitative interviews with offenders in the Scottish town Airdrie (N = 30) that most of the respondents were aware of the existence of CCTV in the town centre and that they had – in contrast to the 'well-behaving' citizens in Regensburg – a reasonable idea of the areas that were covered by the cameras – though this does not necessarily meant that offenders felt deterred to a commit a crime.

- **Attitudes towards CCTV surveillance differ markedly depending on where it is.** Ditton notes that "noticeable more" respondents 'mind' being watched in the streets than being watched in shops or banks (2000: 700). Koskela and Touminen report that more than 90 per cent thought CCTV was appropriate in railways stations, car parks and department stores while a majority found it inappropriate in many kinds of indoor premises such as fitting rooms or restaurant toilets (2003: 126). Similarly a Gallup Poll survey ordered by the Danish Crime Prevention Council (2000) found in 1999 more than two third of the surveyed Danes largely negative towards CCTV in changing rooms, at work or in public toilets. Klauser (2004a) found that only 1-2% of the respondents felt disturbed by surveillance cameras in car parks or pedestrian subways. On the other hand 18% felt disturbed by CCTV in public parks, and 31% by surveillance in residential areas. He concludes that the less social functions a type of space fulfils, the more positive are the attitudes towards surveillance in such spaces, while in contrast CCTV is less accepted in "personal spaces". Though on the one hand confirming this thesis, a second possible explanation offers Hölscher (2003), who

found a majority being supportive of video surveillance in banks, petrol stations, pedestrian subways and railway stations, while opposing CCTV in residential areas, public offices and at the work place. He notes that most of the spaces where CCTV is broadly accepted are already under surveillance. Thus the 'power of facts' might to be of at least similar importance as the desire for intimacy and privacy.

- **Regulation of CCTV is seen as important.** The Danish survey found that 68% of the people that were interviewed wanted to development of CCTV surveillance to be subject to rules (Danish Crime Prevention Council 2000). For Helsinki Koskela and Tuominen (2003) report that 75% of the respondents thought that video surveillance should require a permit, and though the majority felt that business-owners should have the right to use video surveillance, only 2% thought that private persons should have the right to use it freely. Similarly, Klauser (2004b: 114) reports that almost one half of the respondents agree with the statement that "private surveillance of public streets and sidewalks should be avoided". Another 20% do at least agree partially.

To summarise, a majority of respondents to surveys throughout Europe is supportive when asked for their attitude towards CCTV either in general or in the open streets. However, when asked for more details, people draw a clear line and oppose CCTV in 'personal spaces' though it might happen that they get used to it after a while. Between one tenth and more than one third of respondents indicated concerns on the grounds of civil liberties. Variations in support and opposition between the surveys might to some degree be explained by different methodologies and sampling strategies. However, peoples´ attitudes towards CCTV were shown to be contingent on local culture and personal values. Though CCTV schemes are among others often justified by the claim to make people feel safer, the surveys so far indicate that its effects on the fear of crime are marginal. Rather it seems that believe in the general crime effects of CCTV, trust in its benevolent usage and desire for order makes people likely to support CCTV. That many respondents are hardly informed about the locations under surveillance or the actual functions of particular CCTV systems suggests that surveillance cameras are seen as a symbol of social order rather than a means to increase individual safety. However, even the supportive majority demand clear regulations of CCTV in particular of its use by private operators.

3   The URBANEYE survey

3.1   Methodology and sample

Initially it was planned to employ a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to approach the overall objective. While the people's opinions, attitudes and experiences should be studied by a quantitative survey among 500 European citizens and 50 additional in-depth interviews, the effects on deviant behaviour should be examined by a analysis of crime statistics for locations under surveillance. However, we decided to dismiss the latter methodological approach for several reasons: First, to evaluate the crime effects of CCTV by analyses of crime statistics is contested by various criminologist for a variety of methodological concerns and the limited capacity to generalise the findings of such an analysis. Rather Pawson and Tilley (1997), for instance, recommend to study how rather than if CCTV works, and – despite or even because of having shown how to utilise crime statistics for an evaluation of CCTV – Short and Ditton (1998) propose "offender talk" as an additional method to understand the impacts of CCTV on crime. Secondly, the original plan to study the crime effects of CCTV systems that were studied in work package 4 (*CCTV Systems. Their Structures and Practices*) was not feasible because those CCTV systems to which we finally got access for detailed analyses were not comparable. Moreover, the potential basis of crime data was insufficient, e.g. not available for the geographical micro-level that would have been necessary for correlating them to the practice of a particular CCTV system. Instead, we chose to expand the size of our interview sample and finally asked 1,000 citizens for their experiences with CCTV.

The researchers of the URBANEYE consortium agreed to carry out standardised interviews with around 200 citizens per country in the course of summer 2003. The questionnaires used in the different countries were translated versions of the English questionnaire to be found in the annex. It was a four pages questionnaire which includes questions about awareness and knowledge of CCTV, imaginations of surveillance, as well as attitudes towards and experiences with being observed in urban space. Questions for acceptance of CCTV were deliberately chosen not to be preceded by contextualised questions to avoid a bias of the questionnaire. Respondents should be recruited on a random basis by a street survey in different locations across the capital cities of our five countries – preferable in the vicinity of a shopping mall, as CCTV surveillance in this type of urban space was studied in detail in the previous work package.

Eventually, the national research teams had to adapt their recruitment strategy to the local conditions in order to complete the sample in time. Therefore respondents were also recruited in transport centres and shopping malls. Moreover, the team in Oslo also approached local drug users, as these were found among the primary targets of surveillance in the previous work package. Thus Saetnan et.al. note when considering the methodological implications of the sampling experience that "in formal methodological

terms, our respondents represent something between an arbitrary and a strategic sample, but not a random or representative sample." As this is true to more or less degree for all other national samples, we neither could treat our data as a representative sample of the European public nor could we treat them as strictly comparable.

In total 1,001 persons were interviewed between June 1 and October 24, 2003 in Berlin, Budapest, London, Oslo and Vienna as shown in table 1.

Though we agreed on time quota in advance as a means to balance the influence of different street using behaviours, we ended up with a sample that is dominated by morning and afternoon visitors. Only one tenth of the respondents were evening visitors, which to some degree might reflect how people actually frequent the places of survey.

In terms of age and gender, women are slightly underrepresented as well as the elderly. In particular the London sample is dominated by male views as only 41% of the respondents were women. Compared to the average distribution of age in our five countries our overall sample is rather young with almost 20% more respondents aged between 15 and 39 than in demographic reality. In Oslo almost one third of those interviews were younger than 20. This under-representation of elderly reflects to some degree the street usage behaviour this group as we have already seen it in the case of evening visitors.

In terms of education people with very different backgrounds are represented in our survey rather balanced. However, the higher educated make up a relative majority and even outnumber the rest in the London survey. To what extent these differences reflect the national or local realities is not known.

To conclude, we have spoken to a very broad range of people, not only in terms of age and gender but also in terms of professions, political affiliations or ethnic identities. Thus, with some caution, also at the European level we can, as Saetnan et.al. said about their Oslo survey, "claim to have taken the pulse of public opinion on knowledge of, and experience with video surveillance" – at least the pulse we have found present at central urban areas under surveillance.

In addition, research teams have collected qualitative data by individual or group interviews. Interviewees were recruited either at the street survey or by activating wider social networks. The sampling was guided by the interest to talk to people who represent more or less opposing categories, as, for instance, a young, rich women and an old, poor men. In total, 33 persons were interviewed in depth in Berlin, Budapest and Oslo: 18 males and 15 females, six aged younger than 20, 14 aged between 20 and 49 and 13 aged older than 50 and older. These in-depth interviews focused not only on the attitudes to and experiences with CCTV but also addressed question of use of urban space as well as fear and safety.

Table 1: The survey sample

N (% per country)	Berlin	Budapest	London	Oslo	Vienna	Total
8 am –2 pm shift	72 (35.5%)	63 (31.5%)	79 (43.9%)	57 (26.1%)	104 (52.0%)	375 (37.%)
2 pm - 7 pm shift	100 (49.3%)	71 (35.5%)	98 (54.4%)	141 (64.7%)	95 (47.5%)	505 (50.4%)
7 pm - 10 pm shift	31 (15.3%)	66 (33.0%)	1 (0.6%)	20 (9.2%)	1 (0.5%)	116 (11.6%)
Missing values			2 (1.1%)			2 (0.2%)
Male	101 (49.8%)	100 (50.0%)	106 (58.9%)	115 (52.8%)	103 (51.5%)	525 (52.4%)
Female	102 (50.2%)	100 (50.0%)	74 (41.1%)	103 (47.2%)	97 (48.5%)	476 (47.6%)
Aged 15-19	15 (7.4%)	17 (8.5%)	33 (18.3%)	54 (24.8%)	28 (14.0%)	147 (14.7%)
Aged 20-39	69 (34.0%)	67 (33.5%)	105 (58.3%)	75 (34.4%)	87 (43.5%)	403 (40.3%)
Aged 40-59	69 (34.0%)	68 (34.0%)	29 (16.1%)	51 (23.4%)	77 (38.5%)	294 (29.4%)
Aged 60+	50 (24.6%)	48 (24.0%)	13 (7.2%)	38 (17.4%)	8 (4.0%)	157 (15.7%)
School pupils	6 (3.0%)	4 (2.0%)	8 (4.4%)	22 (10.1%)	15 (7.5%)	55 (5.5%)
Elementary school graduates	82 (40.4%)	34 (17.0%)	35 (19.4%)	45 (20.6%)	52 (26.0%)	248 (24.8%)
High school graduates	34 (16.7%)	95 (47.5%)	39 (21.7%)	66 (30.3%)	83 (41.5%)	317 (31.7%)
College graduates	80 (39.4%)	67 (33.5%)	98 (54.4%)	80 (36.7%)	50 (25.0%)	375 (37.5%)
Missing values	1 (0.5%)			5 (2.3%)		6 (0.6%)
Total	203	200	180	218	200	1,001

3.2   The findings

Public opinions on CCTV

Asked whether they consider CCTV to be a good or a bad thing in different types of locations, people answered as shown in the following table.

Table 2: Acceptance of CCTV in different types of locations

	Good	Neutral	Bad
Bank counter	91.8%	3.8%	4.3%
Subway / railway platform	86.5%	9.2%	4.0%
High street shops	82.9%	10.2%	6.8%
Along motorways	62.3%	21.8%	15.4%
Shopping mall walkways	62.2%	23.3%	14.1%
Open high street	56.1%	21.5%	22.3%
Taxi passenger seats	46.5%	24.8%	4.0%
Hospital wards	42.5%	28.4%	28.4%
Outside entrance to homes	35.9%	27.1%	36.6%
Public toilet washrooms	22.1%	17.5%	60.0%
Sports centre changing room	13.8%	17.6%	67.9%
Clothing store fitting room	12.9%	13.6%	73.1%

When cross-tabulating these locations with gender it shows that acceptance of CCTV in different types of locations by women is more or less the same, and only slight differences are found: Women tend to have a more positive attitude (max. 5% difference in high street shops and public toilet washrooms) towards CCTV in 8 of 12 locations. Exceptions: Men value CCTV slightly better than women in clothing store dressing rooms, high streets, hospital wards and along motorways.

However, much more interesting are the cultural differences. Cross-tabulating the attitudes with nationality (or to be precise: the city where the answer was given) shows following results.

Table 3: CCTV is a good thing in… (by cities)

	Berlin	Budapest	London	Oslo	Vienna	Difference between max. and min.
High streets	48.3%	64.7%	90.4%	56.5%	24.5%	65.9%
Along motorways	53.2%	27.4%	80.4%	66.4%	86.0%	58.6%
Taxi passenger seats	51.7%	32.3%	61.7%	72.0%	14.5%	57.5%
Public toilets washroom	16.3%	9.0%	52.0%	34.3%	1.5%	50.5%
Hospital wards	55.2%	33.8%	66.3%	39.3%	20.5%	45.8%
Shopping mall walkways	61.4%	50.2%	90.5%	63.6%	48.5%	42.0%
Outside entrances to home	28.7%	37.3%	52.5%	45.3%	17.0%	35.5%
High street shops	68.5%	83.6%	93.9%	84.6%	85.0%	25.4%
Clothing store fitting rooms	10.3%	8.5%	25.0%	20.6%	1.0%	24.0%
Sports centre changing rooms	11.8%	20.4%	20.0%	16.4%	1.0%	19.4%
Underground / Railway platforms	85.2%	79.1%	94.4%	83.2%	91.5%	15.3%
Bank counters	85.7%	94.0%	93.9%	91.1%	94.5%	8.8%

Culturally most different is the acceptance of open street CCTV (UK vs. Austria: 65.9% difference between the highest and the lowest rate), of surveillance cameras along motorways (Austria vs. Hungary: 58.6%), in taxi passenger seats (Norway vs. Austria: 57.5%), and in public toilets washrooms (UK vs. Austria: 50.5%).

Most similar is the acceptance of CCTV cameras in bank counters (difference: 8.8%), on underground or railway platforms (15.3%) – both with rather high rates of acceptance – and in sports centre changing rooms (19.4%) – with a rather low rate of acceptance.

In total Austria has the lowest rate for 8 of 12 locations, while Britain has the highest rates in 8 of 12 locations. Thus the attitudes reflect the extent of diffusion which we have found for both countries in work package 3. It remains unclear if these different attitudes towards CCTV are a result of the different extent of diffusion, or if the different extent of diffusion is a result of the different attitudes.

To learn more about peoples` attitudes towards CCTV we asked the respondents for their agreement or disagreement with a set of statements. Five of these statements support CCTV, and the other five are critical on CCTV. The results are shown in table 4:

Table 4: Attitudes towards CCTV

	Mostly agree	Undecided	Mostly disagree	Don't know
Nothing to hide, nothing to fear	66.4%	15.1%	17.8%	6.7%
Hidden cams are OK	44.3%	21.6%	33.7%	0.4%
CCTV invades privacy	41.4%	28.6%	27.7%	2.7%
I would welcome CCTV in my street	28.5%	21.8%	48.5%	1.2%
CCTV displaces crime	50.5%	23.6%	21.7%	4.2%
Cameras are a poor substitute for police officers	39.3%	26.5%	29.3%	4.9%
CCTV protects against serious crime	22.8%	18.6%	56.4%	2.2%
Footage can be easily misused	53.2%	24.7%	17.2%	4.8%
Unfair use by discriminatory targeting	24.3%	19.7%	49.7%	6.3%
I would feel safer with CCTV everywhere	25.4%	24.7%	48.0%	1.8%

A contradictory picture: Almost one half of the respondents agree with the statements that they would feel safer with CCTV everywhere, though also one half would not welcome CCTV it the streets where they live. Another 44% consider the deployment of hidden cameras as OK, though 41% think that CCTV invades privacy and 53% agree with the statement that footage can be easily misused.

Moreover, most of the respondents seem to perceive surveillance cameras as an unavoidable but questionable tool in terms of effectiveness: Two third agree with the notion "who has nothing to hide has nothing to fear". But more than 50% believe that CCTV displaces crime and does not protect against serious crime.

Again the attitudes towards CCTV are found to be very different when comparing the results between the cities. How people in the different cities agree with these statements is shown in table 5.

In European comparison the most optimistically about CCTV were respondents in Britain: More than two third of the respondents in London would welcome CCTV in their street, and almost on half would feel safer with CCTV everywhere. In particular believe in the power of CCTV to protect against serious crime seems to explain this optimism as 47% agreed with this statement.

The most sceptical were respondents in Austria: Less than one tenth of the interviewed Austrians would welcome CCTV in their street, believe that it protects against serious crime or would feel safer with CCTV everywhere or think that hidden cameras are OK. Less than one half agrees with the statement that those who have nothing to hide have nothing to fear. However, the scepticism does not correlate with concerns about privacy issues, discriminatory targeting practices or a substitution of frontline policing, but with the believe that CCTV displaces crime and can be easily misused.

Respondents in Hungary were the least sensitive to privacy issues and potential misuse. Three fourth agreed with the statement that those who have nothing to hide have nothing to fear. More than 70% think that hidden cameras are OK and only a third believe that footage can be easily misused.

Those interviewed in Germany were the most sensitive about human rights as almost one half consider CCTV as a violation of privacy and nearly 40% believe unfair use due to discriminatory targeting practices. Moreover, nearly two third agreed with the statement that CCTV is a poor substitute for police officers.

Table 5: Agreement with statements on CCTV (by cities)

	Berlin	Budapest	London	Oslo	Vienna	Diff. max-min
Hidden cams are OK	37.4%	72.1%	67.2%	41.3%	6.0%	66.1%
I would welcome CCTV in my street	28.6%	29.4%	68.5%	17.5%	3.5%	65.0%
Cameras are a poor substitute for police officers	65.5%	22.4%	44.4%	44.5%	19.5%	46.0%
CCTV protects against serious crime	23.8%	14.9%	46.6%	27.1%	4.0%	42.6%
I would feel safer with CCTV everywhere	29.2%	22.4%	45.6%	28.4%	3.5%	42.1%
Footage can be easily misused	65.7%	31.3%	55.0%	41.8%	73.0%	41.7%
Nothing to hide, nothing to fear	70.0%	77.6%	75.0%	67.1%	43.0%	34.6%
CCTV displaces crime	55.2%	55.2%	40.6%	35.8%	65.5%	29.7%
Unfair use by discriminatory targeting	39.1%	17.4%	29.1%	22.8%	13.5%	25.6%
CCTV invades privacy	49.3%	37.8%	41.1%	42.9%	35.5%	13.9%

Awareness: Feeling the gaze rather than seeing the eye

74.8% (747) of the respondents believed the site to be under surveillance, but only 35.8% (294) were able to point to the nearest camera. 42.9% (352) had no idea were the nearest camera was and another 6.8% (56) gave an inaccurate answer. In detail:

Table 6: Knowledge of both site and CCTV surveillance in the area of survey

	Area is under surveillance	(a) Inaccurate answer to question for nearest camera	(b) No answer to question for nearest camera	Sum (a+b)
Daily visitor	82.0%	4.3%	34.3%	38.6%
Frequently	75.4%	9.9%	40.3%	50.2%
Occasionally	69.9%	7.5%	48.9%	56.4%
First time	74.5%	3.8%	50.0%	53.8%

Striking is the fact that in Berlin 76.6% of the interviewed had no idea where the nearest camera was or gave an inaccurate answer though 58.7% of them said to visit the site daily or frequently.

In contrast, in London where also a majority of respondents (58.4%) said to visit the site daily or frequently only one third (33.4%) was lacking knowledge about the location of the nearest camera.

Imaginations of CCTV

Asked to make a guess how many CCTV cameras are...

Table 7: Peoples´ imaginations of the potentials of CCTV

	All/most	Few/none	Don´t know
Recording	59.8%	28.8%	11.4%
Monitored	45.2%	48.4%	6.3%
Hidden	30.7%	56.3%	13.0%
Taking close-up images of faces	35.9%	47.7%	16.4%
Automatically recognising individuals or licence plates	28.5%	59.4%	12.1%
Picking up conversations	16.5%	74.4%	9.1%

Compared with what we found in work package 3 it turns out that most of the respondents give a rather realistic appraisal of the power of CCTV. However, a significant minority seems to overestimate the socio-technological sophistication. Moreover, the ratings for recording and monitoring suggest that this significant minority believes CCTV to be a tool of active prevention rather than passive repression and thus

underestimates the reality which is according to our work package 3 dominated by hardly monitored but recorded surveillance systems.

Effects

Asked whether the appraisal about what the observers in a mall are looking for does affect the behaviour in the mall, the answers were the following:

Table 8: Does CCTV affect your behaviour?

	Norway	Germany	Hungary	Austria	Britain	Total
Yes	11.4%	19.4%	33.8%	20.5%	16.7%	20.4% (201)
No	88.6%	80.6%	66.2%	71.5%	83.3%	77.9% (766)
Don´t know	-	-	-	8.0%	-	1.6% (16)

While in Norway only one out of ten respondents thought that her or his behaviour is affected, one third of the Hungarian respondents thought so. The differences in how women and men answered this question were only marginal.

However, age showed to be an important predictor. Almost one third (29.4%) of the teenagers (15-19) CCTV to have effects on their behaviour, while this was only thought by 14.4% of the elderly (60+). Thus the young generation is most likely to be affected by CCTV, which reminds us of the ancient and almost universal tradition of disciplining the youngsters by rites of initiation in order to make them part of society.[3]

Trust and regulation

In the area where interviewed 43.4% of all respondents would feel most comfortable with video surveillance which is both monitored and recorded on a permanent basis. Only 6.8% answered that they would feel most comfortable with no system at all.

Asked for the observers with whom they would feel most comfortable if open street CCTV is in operation, the respondents answered as follows:

---

[3]   Pupils, for example, were named *discipuli* in ancient Rome.

Table 9: Most trusted CCTV operators (by cities)

	Oslo	Berlin	Budapest	Vienna	London	Total
Police	58.5%	52.7%	56.7%	50.5%	63.3%	56.1% (547)
Private security guards	14.0%	26.9%	24.4%	23.5%	24.7%	22.6% (220)
Local property owners or their employees	4.3%	1.0%	4.0%	7.5%	1.8%	3.6% (37)
Volunteer citizens	6.8%	1.0%	6.5%	-	4.8%	3.8% (37)
Other	4.8%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.8%	2.4% (23)
None of the above	1.9%	9.0%	7.5%	17.5%	0.6%	7.5% (73)
Combinations of the above						3.3% (32)
Don´t know						0.6% (6)
Total						99.9% (975)

It seems that the most trusted observer across Europe is the police, while being observed by private individuals is least supported.

Asked for the importance of regulation the picture looks like it is shown in table 10 (multiple answers possible).

Table 10: Respondents´ views on the importance of regulating CCTV

	Very important	Somehow important	Not important
Restricted access for the media	80.9%	14.2%	4.8%
Restricted access for commercial interests	79.5%	12.6%	7.2%
Inspection	73.8%	13.4%	12.6%
Registration and licensing of CCTV systems	69.2%	19.4%	11.0%
Access to (image) data	61.9%	22.5%	15.4%
Signage	53.0%	25.9%	20.9%
Limited storage times of footage	38.5%	35.1%	25.4%
Restricted access for the police	29.9%	20.6%	48.7%

In general regulation was seen as very important by the majority of respondents. In particular restriction of disclosure of data to the media and commercial interests were seen as of primary importance. Again the data suggest that the police are most trusted as the restriction of disclosure of image data to the police was seen as not important by almost 50% of the respondents. Interesting: Signage and limitation of storage time was seen as much less important as making the systems subject of inspection of registration.

How the question for the importance of regulation was answered in each city is shown in table 11.

Table 11: Regulations seen as very important (by cities)

	Berlin	Budapest	London	Oslo	Vienna	Diff. max-min.
Inspection	93.0%	83.6%	90.3%	90.6%	13.0%	77.6%
Registration and licensing of CCTV systems	85.0%	64.2%	86.9%	90.1%	21.5%	68.6%
Access to (image) data	53.2%	39.8%	57.7%	67.8%	90.5%	50.7%
Limited storage times of footage	65.7%	22.4%	34.7%	43.8%	26.0%	43.3%
Restricted access for the police	20.9%	56.2%	14.6%	29.1%	26.5%	41.6%
Restricted access for commercial interests	97.0%	56.7%	69.8%	82.3%	90.5%	40.3%
Restricted access for the media	93.0%	66.2%	87.7%	82.0%	75.0%	26.8%
Signage	45.0%	54.2%	64.4%	55.6%	47.0%	19.4%

The cultural differences in the views on regulation are most significant for inspection and registration, in particular due to the rather uninterested position that Austrian respondents had about these issues. Least controversial across Europe are the positions on signage and the restrictions of media access to footage.

4   References

Armitage, Rachel (2002): *To CCTV or not to CCTV? A review of current research into the effectiveness of CCTV systems in reducing crime*, London: NACRO
http://www.nacro.org.uk/data/briefings/nacro-2002062800-csps.pdf

Brown, Sheila (1999): "What´s the problem girls? CCTV and the gendering of public safety", in: Surveillance, Closed-Circuit Television and social control, by Clive Norris, Jade Moran & Gary Armstrong, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 207-220

Danish Crime Prevention Council (2000): *CCTV surveillance. Between prevention and privacy. A booklet for debate from The Danish Crime Prevention Council on attitudes to and experience with CCTV surveillance*, Copenhagen

Ditton, Jason (1999): "Public support for town centre CCTV schemes: myth or reality?" in: *Surveillance, Closed-Circuit Television and social control*, ed. by Clive Norris, Jade Moran & Gary Armstrong, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 221-228

Ditton, Jason (2000): "Crime and the city. Public attitudes towards open-street CCTV in Glasgow", in: *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 40, pp.692-709

Ditton, Jason & Emma Short (1999): "Yes, it works, no, it doesn't. Comparing the effects of open-street CCTV in two adjacent Scottish town centres", in: *Surveillance of public space. CCTV, street lightning and crime prevention* (Crime Prevention Studies Vol. 10), ed. by Kate Painter & Nick Tilley, New York. Criminal Justice Press, pp. 201-223

European Opinion Research Group (2003): *Special Eurobarometer 196. Data Protection*, http://europa.eu.int/comm/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_196_data_protection.pdf

Flight, Sander & Yvonne van Heerwaarden (2003): *Evaluatie cameratoezicht Amsterdam. Effectmeting August Albéplein, Belgiëplein en Kraaiennest* , Amsterdam: DSP Groep.
http://www.amsterdam.nl/contents/pages/00002790/eindrapportdspevaluatie.pdf

Foucault, Michel (1977): *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*, London: Penguin

Hempel, Leon & Eric Töpfer (2001): *Inception Report*, Urbaneye working paper No. 1,
www.urbaneye.net/results/ue_wp1.pdf

Hölscher, Michael (2003): "Sicherheitsgefühl und Überwachung. Eine empirische Studie zu Einstellungen der Bürger zur Videoüberwachung und ihrer Erklärung", in. *Kriminologisches Journal*, No. 35, pp. 42-56

Klauser, Francisco (2004a): "Die Entwicklung einer *Sicherheitsstadt', in: *digma. Zeitschrift für Datenschutz und Informationssicherheit*, 2004/1, pp. 24-29

Klauser, Francisco (2004b): „Die Veränderung der urbanen Territorialität infolge der Videoüberwachung des öffentlichen Raums. Ein Vergleich unterschiedlicher räumlicher Funktionsweisen der Videoüberwachung", in: *Geographica Helvetica. Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geographie*, No. 2/2004, pp. 106-118

Klocke, Gabriele & Group of Scholars (2001): "Das Hintertürchen des Nichtwissens. Was Regensburger BürgerInnen über die Videoüberwachung in ihrer Stadt wissen und denken", in: *Bürgerrechte & Polizei / CILIP*, No. 69, 2/2001, http://www.cilip.de/ausgabe/69/video.htm

Koskela, Hille (1999): "'Safe to be afraid': Video surveillance and women´s perception of safety", in: Fear, control and space. *Geographies of gender, fear of violence and video surveillance*, ed. by Hille Koskela, Helsinki: University of Helsinki

Koskela, Hille & Martti Tuominen (2003): *"Kakspiippunen juttu" Tutkimus helsinkiläisten suhtautumiseta kameravalvontaan*, Helsinki: Jultkaisija Utgivare Publisher (City of Heslinki Urban Facts Research Series 2003/3)

Norris, Clive & Gary Armstrong (1999): *The maximum surveillance society. The rise of CCTV*, Oxford: Berg

McCahill, Mike (2002): *The Surveillance Web. The rise of visual surveillance in an English city*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing

McCahill, Mike & Clive Norris (2002): *CCTV in Britain*, Urbaneye working paper No. 3, www.urbaneye.net/results/ue_wp3.pdf

Pawson, Ray und Nick Tilley (1997): *Realistic evaluation*, London: Sage

Phillips, Coretta (1999): "A review of CCTV evaluations. Crime reduction effects and attitudes towards its use", in: *Surveillance of public space. CCTV, street lightning and crime prevention*, ed. by K. Painter and N. Tilley. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 123-156

Reuband, Karl-Heinz (2001): "Videoüberwachung. Was die Bürger von der Überwachung halten", in: *Neue Kriminalpolitik*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 5-9

Short, Emma und Jason Ditton (1998): Seen and now heard. Talking to the targets of open street CCTV, in: *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 404-429

Welsh, Brendon C. & David P. Farrington (2002): *Crime prevention effects of CCTV. A systematic review*, Home Office Research Study 252, August 2002, http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/hors252.pdf