**On the Threshold to Urban Panopticon?
Analysing the Employment of CCTV in European
Cities and Assessing its Social and Political Impacts**

RTD-Project (September 2001 – February 2004)
5th Framework Programme of the European Commission
Contract No.: HPSE-CT2001-00094

info@urbaneye.net
www.urbaneye.net

Working Paper No. 12

Views from under surveillance.
Public opinion in a closely watched area in Oslo

Ann Rudinow Sætnan, Johanne Yttri Dahl, and Heidi Mork Lomell

ann.r.saetnan@svt.ntnu.no
johanney@stud.ntnu.no
h.m.lomell@nchr.uio.no

Department for Sociology and Political Science
Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Dragvoll, 7491 Trondheim

Norwegian Centre for Human Rights
Faculty of Law
University of Oslo
P.O Box 6706 St. Olavs plass, 0130 Oslo

Norway

January 2004

Project Co-ordination:

Centre for Technology and Society
Technical University Berlin
www.ztg.tu-berlin.de

Table of contents

1 Background for the study

This is the fourth report[1] from the Norwegian contribution to the EU-financed international comparative project UrbanEye. Previously in the project, we have:

- examined the legal framework and media discourses surrounding video surveillance in our respective countries (work package 2, for Denmark and Norway see Wiecek & Sætnan 2002a),
- mapped the density of video surveillance in our respective capital cities, including a door-to-door study of one major multi-use street (work package 3, for Copenhagen and Oslo see Wiecek & Sætnan 2002b), and
- studied the work practices of a number of video surveillance control rooms (work package 4, for control rooms in Copenhagen and Oslo see Lomell, Sætnan & Wiecek 2003).

Now in work package 5 our goal has been to study public opinions and responses to video surveillance and their use of urban spaces in general. We have done so by means of a survey questionnaire administered to 200+ members of the public in an area under video surveillance, as well as 10+ thematically structured longer interviews with individuals and small groups strategically sampled to represent categories within that public that our earlier research and readings had led us to believe might have particular relevance to use of public spaces and views on/responses to surveillance.

Public opinion is generally seen as a worthwhile object of study in its own right, for instance in the interests of democratizing a policy decision or the evaluation of earlier policy decisions. Several such opinion studies, aimed at informing policy and/or evaluations of policy have been carried out before ours, including one each in Norway and Denmark.

1.1 Previous opinion polls

In 1997, the Data Protection Agency and the State Information Service commissioned Statistics Norway to conduct a poll concerning people's attitudes to various privacy issues, including some relating to video surveillance (Statistics Norway 1997). 1542 respondents were polled.

One question concerned the balance between privacy and crime detection priorities. 68% of the respondents felt that "clearing up crime is as a rule more important than

[1] This report is a joint product, with Sætnan coordinating efforts. All three authors participated equally in the survey data collection. Dahl conducted the individual and group interviews, with Sætnan and Lomell assisting at one group interview each. All have contributed text throughout the report. Lomell contributed the first draft of section 1.1 and tool responsibility for literature overview and references. Dahl contributed the first draft of sections 2.2, 3.3, and 4.1 and took responsibility for selecting interview quotes throughout. Sætnan contributed the first draft of the remaining sections and took responsibility for translations to English and final editing.

protecting personal privacy," 15% responded that both were equally important, 17% that "protection of personal privacy should as a rule be given more priority." Responding to a question dealing more directly with video surveillance, 67% responded that they "to a very small extent felt any discomfort when in an area under video surveillance." 26% responded that they were uncomfortable to "a small extent," 5% "to a fairly large extent," and only 1% "to a very large extent."

Researchers also asked respondents for their views on video surveillance in four different settings: post offices, railway stations, garage structures in residential areas, and passenger spaces of taxis. Respondents were on the whole more supportive towards surveillance in post offices (94%) and railway stations (87%) than garage structures (59%) or taxis (33%). For most settings, older respondents were more supportive of surveillance than younger respondents, although differences were small for the settings where overall support was highest. Also, conservative voters and non-voters were more supportive of surveillance than socialist voters, voters who declined to state a party preference, or voters who responded that they were unsure which party they most favored at the time. Support for surveillance also tended to be lower and opposition higher in groups with more education. For most settings there were only negligible differences between men's and women's responses, but women were markedly less opposed to surveillance in taxis (41% for, 59% against) than were men (32% for, 61% against).

In 2001 this poll was presented in the newspaper Aftenposten (2001/4/2) in an article titled "Two out of three accept video surveillance." In the article, Anne Nyeggen from the Data Protection Agency is quoted as commenting that "it seems that people don't care as long as the surveillance is 'fighting crime'."

Autumn 1999 the Danish Crime Prevention Council took the initiative for an opinion poll in Denmark. 514 Danes were polled via telephone and another 10 interviewed at greater length. Most respondents (60%) were positive towards video surveillance in general, but about 20% were opposed and furthermore opinions varied with the places respondents were asked to consider. Respondents tended to support video surveillance in banks (93% largely positive), petrol stations (90%), train stations (88%), shops (78%), areas in malls (74%), just outside shops (62%) and pedestrian streets (53%). However, the majority were negative to video surveillance in spaces where they expected more intimacy and/or autonomy – changing rooms (81% largely negative), at work (66%), public toilets (66%), and entrance to or road where you live (61%) (Crime Prevention Council 2000: 12-13).

In January 2003, the Danish newspaper Berlingske Tidene (2003/1/19) commissioned the Danish Gallup Institute to conduct a poll on video surveillance. 902 respondents were polled. The three questions were:

- **It is currently being discussed whether to install surveillance cameras in the suburban train system as a measure to reduce crime and the growing problems with**

vandalism and littering on the trains. In your opinion, is this a good idea or a bad idea?
87% responded that they thought this was a good idea, 5% that it was a bad idea, and 8% that they didn't know. Berlingske Tidene presents these data in a table broken down by respondents' gender, but there are quite obviously no significant differences.

- **Would you personally feel safer when out in risky public places if there were more cameras there than there are now?**
  Here there is less support for surveillance. Overall, 30% respond that they would "definitely" feel safer, 27% that they would "most likely" feel safer, 20% "most likely not" and 19% "definitely not." Women more often respond that they would feel safer (36% definitely, 27% most likely) than do men (23% definitely, 26% most likely), as do older respondents more than younger ones (39% and 22% for respondents 60 and over, 30% and 27% for respondents 36-59, 22% and 31% for respondents 18-35).
- **With which of the following statements do you most agree? A: To create better security, more surveillance cameras should be installed in risky public spaces. B: To avoid creating a surveillance society, cameras should only to a limited extent be installed in risky public spaces.**
  Overall, 55% agreed most with statement A, 42% most with statement B, while 3% were undecided. Differences between gender categories were negligible (54% of men and 56% of women agreed most with statement A) and differences between age categories only slightly greater (51% of respondents 18-35, 56% of those 36-59, and 59% of those 60 and over agreed most with statement A).

1.2 Our own opinion poll goals

In our own project, the opinion poll phase also has further implications, beyond the simple (although valuable!) democratization of discourses on video surveillance and beyond the scientifically valuable task of checking whether the above-described results are reproduced. Firstly, CCTV has largely been discussed and regulated in terms of privacy versus protection (Davies 1998, Taylor 2002). We wanted to get a more detailed sense of how invasive and how protective the public felt CCTV to be and where they felt CCTV to lie between these two poles.

Second, it seems likely that the privacy-protection dimension is linked with a dimension of spatial meanings – some spaces are felt to be more private than others, some more dangerous than others (Koskela 1999). Furthermore, this spatial dimension is probably culturally contingent as well as contingent on local, group, and personal experiences. We wanted to explore, in our respective capital cities, the types of spaces where privacy or protection were felt to be most relevant, both for the population as a whole and for different segments of the population. We also wanted to explore how powerful the public thought CCTV to be as an agent for protection and/or for privacy invasion.

Third, social science literature on CCTV has also raised questions regarding the behavioural consequences of CCTV: Is there a panopticon effect? Does the sense of being watched lead to internalization of the watcher and thereby to self-discipline? (Foucault 1977 and (among others) Fyfe & Bannister 1996, Herbert 1996, Soja 1996, Hannah 1997, Norris & Armstrong 1999, Fox 2001) This aspect is extremely difficult to study: Watching for behavioral changes in a given space before and after introduction of CCTV would be prohibitively time-consuming. Watching for behavioral differences between similar spaces with and without CCTV, while less time-consuming, introduces other factors into the behavioral "equation." And in either case, watching becomes in itself another gaze affecting the space and potentially adding to the panopticon factor. Asking people whether they themselves are aware of behaving differently in spaces under surveillance presumes both self-awareness and honest self-disclosure, neither of which can be taken for granted. Nevertheless, we wished to explore the theme at least by that method.

Fourth, our own research (Lomell, Sætnan & Wiecek 2003) as well as that of others (Norris & Armstrong 1999, Wakefield 2000, von Hirsch & Shearing 2000, McCahill 2002) has shown yet another potential social effect of CCTV, namely that of social exclusion. We wanted to explore awareness of this effect both amongst the general public and within marginalized groups, i.e. groups likely to be subject to such exclusion.

And finally, seeking to further the democratization goal of opinion polls, we wished to find out what regulatory routines the public thought worthwhile and important for controlling CCTV usage.

2 Study design and data characteristics

Our commitments for this work package were twofold: A questionnaire-based survey of at least 100 people at two urban sites per city (one under or near open street video surveillance and one near a shopping mall with video surveillance), and longer interviews with at least 10 persons representing a variety of population segments likely to have different ways of using urban spaces and different experiences of/views on video surveillance. Copenhagen was not included in this work package.

2.1 The questionnaire survey

The questionnaire was designed to be administrated to passers-by at the selected sites. This meant that it had to be kept short. We felt it would be extremely difficult to recruit respondents unless we could reasonably claim that it would take less than 10 minutes to respond. Nevertheless, we wished to ask questions that would probe deeper than simply opinions on video surveillance in general. For instance, experience with a questionnaire used amongst (primarily) children at a science fair day October 2002 had shown that though response was overwhelmingly positive when the question concerned video surveillance in general, respondents were predominantly negative to video surveillance in certain types of locations (e.g. dressing rooms or public toilets) and nuanced in their views on specific traits of surveillance such as its effectiveness or its susceptibility to abuse(Dahl et al. 2003). We wanted to follow up on such questions among a broader range of the population. Furthermore, while some degree of comparability with earlier studies was desirable, we also wished to explore areas we saw others as having neglected (e.g. the public's priorities as to regulations of surveillance, or how the public saw themselves as reacting to surveillance).

After negotiations within the group and some tinkering and testing, we arrived at a questionnaire that could be administered in 10 minutes if the respondent did not become engaged by the theme and make additional comments (which many did, as it turned out). This questionnaire was developed in English, then translated into the necessary languages. The Norwegian version is appended to this report.

The questionnaire addresses the following issues:

1. respondent's awareness of and response to being in an area under surveillance.
2. respondent's observation of surveillance cameras elsewhere in the city.
3. respondent's views on the desirability of surveillance in a number of types of spaces. The list of such spaces was designed to check for differences in views on surveillance in public vs. privately owned areas and open vs. intimate spaces.
4. respondent's estimate of the extent and power of surveillance installations in the city.
5. respondent's views on specific aspects of surveillance effectiveness and acceptability.

6. respondent's preferences as to technical capabilities and institutional grounding of surveillance.
7. respondent's priorities as to regulations governing surveillance.
8. respondent's assumptions as to what actions and persons surveillance is directed towards.
9. respondent's opinion as to how surveillance affects his/her own actions.
10. background data: respondent's age, gender, education, and self-perceived minority or non-minority appearance.

In advance of conducting the interviews, we agreed that each country should attempt to achieve a distribution of respondents roughly corresponding to the average age and gender distribution of the population in Europe overall for the age range of respondents we were targeting. We had also decided a minimum age of 13 for respondents. The age and gender distribution of the Norwegian population is very close to the European average, as shown in table 1. At the end of each day's interviews, we tabulated our respondents by age and gender to check whether we needed to adjust our recruitment strategies. We believe our respondents' age and gender distribution (see table 2) came as close to the target as could be achieved and that our deviation from it is largely due to the nature of the interview site, as will be discussed below.

Table 1. Age distributions in the 6 participating countries as of 1.1.2000 – separately, averaged, and averages for all 15 EU countries.

Age	EU15	Den-mark	Ger-many	Austria	Britain	Norway	Hungary	6 country avg.
< 15	17	18	16	17	19	20	17	17
15-19	6	5	6	6	6	6	7	6
20-39	29	29	29	31	29	29	28	29
40-59	26	28	27	26	25	26	28	26
60+	22	20	23	20	20	19	20	22

Source: Statistisches Bundesamt, *Eurostat Database New Cronos*

In Oslo, the open street surveillance area is adjacent to a major transport center and several shopping malls, all with extensive video surveillance systems. Thus we could meet the two site targets for Oslo from a single location – the public square between the entrances to the transport centre and the nearest shopping mall, an area also covered by the open street surveillance system. We nevertheless attempted to interview also at a second site – outside an exclusive commercial and residential complex with public access

to the adjacent waterfront and surveillance both within the complex and (illegally) on the open street outside the complex. At this latter site, however, we were unsuccessful in recruiting respondents.

Table 2. Respondents in Oslo by gender and age.[2]

	male	female	Total
13-19	28	26	54
	24,3%	25,2%	24,8%
20-39	37	38	75
	32,2%	36,9%	34,4%
40-59	33	18	51
	28,7%	17,5%	23,4%
60+	17	21	38
	14,8%	20,4%	17,4%
Total	115	103	218
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
	(52,8%)	(47,2%)	(100,0%)

Outside the transport center, however, recruitment of respondents went fairly smoothly in certain spots: People waiting for a bus, seated at some steps by the sidewalk, were often willing to be interviewed, but had to cut off the interview abruptly when their bus arrived. We have included these incomplete interviews, but have increased the overall number of interviews to supplement them.

As we had sunny, warm weather for most of the week we conducted our interviews (just over one week in early June 2003), the south-facing steps between two levels of the public square were full of people much of the day, from mid-morning when the sun climbed high enough above the transport center to reach the steps until mid-evening when it set. Here we were fairly successful recruiting respondents. These could be downtown workers on lunch break, job-seekers taking a breather, people on holidays from elsewhere in Norway or abroad, transport passengers waiting in the sunshine rather than indoors, people from the drug scene who tend to "hang about" in the vicinity of the square, and towards evening people waiting to meet friends there before going out on the town. Outside of school hours some were quite young. Few were elderly. The square is also at times full of people passing through to or from the transport center or mall,

[2] Note that the age categories in our sample do not precisely match the census categories of Table 1. We chose not to interview persons under age 13. We also assume that we were less likely to meet very old people in the area.

however we found that almost only people seated or standing still were willing to be interviewed.

To improve our recruitment of middle-aged and elderly respondents, we gained permission to interview inside the waiting hall of the transport center. We concentrated on middle-aged and elderly persons seated in the waiting areas. Here we had some success recruiting middle-aged and elderly respondents if they had some time to wait for their journey, however middle-aged women were notably more reticent than men and fewer elderly men than women were present.

We also walked across to the south end of the square, to the city's drug scene. Here we interviewed a number of men (again, the women here were notably more reticent, though we did interview some women on the stairs who mentioned being part of that drug scene). We got the impression that the people here were quite pleased to be interviewed about something other than their drug habits. Furthermore, surveillance was something they were quite interested in and knowledgeable about. For obvious reasons, our interviews here were not random. We interviewed people who were sober enough to make sense of the questions and answer them and who were not at that moment desperately seeking drugs to treat withdrawal symptoms. Several of our respondents here claimed to be in a methadone treatment program and thereby in some sense recovered from their addiction.

Who are our respondents? In what sense do they represent Norwegian opinions and experiences? The answer is that they are by no means a representative sample of the Norwegian public. They are not a random sample, since we had no way of knowing who comprises the total population of the space(s) where we interviewed. With no such overview, we could not conduct a random selection. We tried to curb any unreflected biases we might have had by systematically inviting all those seated on a segment of steps if they would be willing to participate, that is all who were not engaged in some other conversation. In addition, we targeted our invitations by apparent age and gender if our evening tally from the previous day showed that we were drifting off our target distribution. And finally, we made a point of interviewing some at the drug scene, as these are a group of people strongly affected by video surveillance and rarely asked their opinions on general political issues. Thus, in formal methodological terms, our respondents represent something between an arbitrary and a strategic sample, but not a random or representative sample.

Furthermore, we have to ask what population they are a sample of. The sites where we recruited our respondents have characteristics that affect who, among all in Norway at any given time, are likely to be there. Young children, or even young teens, are not likely to visit that area unaccompanied; due to the widely-known presence of the drug scene, parents are likely to try to keep their children away from that area unless in transit via the transport center. Also adults who are "faint of heart" might tend to avoid the area if

they can, or at least avoid talking to strangers (including researcher strangers). Commuters pass through in large numbers, but we were unsuccessful in recruiting respondents who were in a hurry on their way to or from the transport center. Thus our sample is likely to overrepresent Oslo residents, tourists, and travellers waiting for long-distance (i.e. less frequent) trains relative to the total distribution of people who passed through the area on any given day in our interview period. And it is likely to overrepresent those not fearful of a reputedly crime-burdened area.

That said, what background data we have, including extra information spontaneously offered, show that we spoke to a very broad range of people, not only in terms of age and gender but also in terms of educations, professions, political views, ethnic identities etc. – from paupers to, well ... not princes, but for instance stock brokers. Furthermore, we have included some groups not normally asked their opinions on local political issues such as surveillance – e.g. tourists, drug addicts, criminals, children. In that sense, our survey sample may be broader than those generally produced by standard random sampling routines or by elections. With some caution, we can therefore nevertheless claim to have taken the pulse of public opinion on, knowledge of, and experiences with video surveillance – at least the pulse of that public we found present in an area of high surveillance density and intensity.

2.2 The interviews

Our interviews consist of thematically structured conversation-like interviews with individuals and small groups. Seven adults (four men and three women, ranging in age from early 20's to mid-60's) were interviewed individually and six children (two boys and four girls, ages 13-14) in two group interviews.

Studies such as Norris and Armstrong (1999) and our own study of control rooms in Oslo and Copenhagen (Lomell, Sætnan and Wiecek 2003) have found that youths, males, "scruffies" (e.g. apparent drug addicts) and ethnic minorities are targeted by surveillance operators disproportionately to their share of the population in areas under surveillance. Therefore, for our in-depth interviews, we strategically sampled informants to represent categories within the public that this earlier research and reading had led us to believe might have particular relevance to use of public spaces and views on and responses to surveillance. However, we did not want to interview only groups marked or marginalized by CCTV. We also wanted to interview "normal" (unmarked, majority, mainstream) users of these public spaces.

We also wanted to include some children or young teens in our interviews. Children are rarely polled for their opinions on policy issues, but, as mentioned above, we had done so on the occasion of a science fair day. Over 250 children had answered our questionnaire on that occasion as well as nearly 150 adults. The children turned out, sometimes to their own surprise, to have clear and reasoned opinions on the subject of CCTV, often opinions that differed significantly from those of the adults (Dahl et al

2003). We therefore wished to explore the opinions and experiences of children in greater depth.

To recruit children for interviews we contacted two middle schools, one on the wealthy side of town (west of the city center) and one in the side of town populated predominantly by working class and/or recent immigrant families (east of the city center). Each school recruited for us a group of children and provided a room for a group interview. At a school west of the city center we interviewed two girls and two boys ages 13 and 14 years old; at a school east of the city center, two 13 year-old girls.

For our adult informants, the initial plan was to ask those we interviewed for the questionnaire if they would be willing to participate in a longer interview. However, the questionnaires turned out to take so much time that most people were simply relieved when they were completed. We only managed to recruit two people for longer interviews in this way.

- The area around the railway station is one of the most surveilled areas in Oslo. It is also an area well prepared to handle handicapped people. We chose to interview a man in a wheel chair because of this. He was 37 years old. We came in touch with him while doing the survey. He answered the questionnaire, expressed an interest towards the subject and was willing to be interviewed.
- Before we started collecting our data for work package 5 we had heard stories about drug-addicts and prostitutes co-opting CCTV in Oslo, turning it from a weapon against them to a tool for their own protection. Of course this made us especially interested in hearing their views and their experiences with CCTV. Unfortunately weren't we able to get an interview with a prostitute. But as our interviewing site is a widely known area for drug addicts to hang out, we came in touch with several drug addicts. We did an interview with one man, who was 40 years old.

For the rest of our informants we activated our social networks to achieve informants with different ages, a range of social backgrounds and also different relations to the use of city center.

One young man of 27 years, working downtown Oslo was interviewed, as well as a male commuter, age 54, working in Oslo. We also interviewed three women, all three working in down town Oslo: One young woman student (27), a woman legal adviser (60) and a Middle-Eastern woman (50) employed in a "pink collar" job.

The in-depth interviews focused not only on CCTV but also included questions on fear and safety, as well as use of space.

3 Public opinions on surveillance

In this section we will present a first overview of our results. These will be presented in three sections: general views on surveillance, a thematic analysis on surveillance and trust, a brief analysis in terms of population sub-groups within the sample. The analysis here will rest primarily on the survey data, with excerpts from the interviews serving to illustrate key points. Further analyses of the data will be presented in other contexts. We are working on several articles, a doctoral dissertation, and an MA thesis.

3.1 "It's not desirable, but it may be necessary, unfortunately. It smacks of 1984."[3]

Two of the main question sets on the survey concerned general opinions on surveillance. Question 4(a-l) was a list of 12 types of places where video surveillance is known to occur. We asked whether the respondents felt it was a good thing, a bad thing, or neutral when surveillance systems were installed in each of these categories of places. If we code the responses so that +1 indicates a positive view on surveillance, -1 a negative view and 0 a neutral view for each category, then summing the values of variables from question 4 into a scalar variable can serve as an indicator of the respondents' overall views on video surveillance. This scale ranges from +12 (positive to surveillance in all 12 location types) to -12 (negative to surveillance in all 12 location types).

Table 3 shows that on the whole, more of our respondents are on the positive end of the scale than on the negative end. Fewer than 20% gave negative responses more often than positive ones. No respondents gave negative responses to all 12 location types, whereas thirteen respondents gave positive responses to all 12. In total, for the 203 with valid responses to all 12 site types, the average for the scale came to +3.5764. And yet, though the positive number indicates more positive than negative answers, this does not represent a blanket acceptance of video surveillance everywhere and anywhere. Some of our respondents interrupted our standard introduction[4] to say "Oh, I'm all for it!" only to discover, in the course of the survey interview, that they had some reservations that hadn't occurred to them immediately.

[3] Quote from man 60+ in response to prompt about video surveillance in the passenger spaces of taxis.

[4] We wore our university ID tags and, in a compromise between fully informed consent and brevity, introduced ourselves something like this: "Hi. I'm from the university and I'm here in connection with a research project on video surveillance. Do you have 10 minutes to participate in an opinion poll?"

Table 3. Scale of responses regarding views on video surveillance at 12 types of sites.

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
-12	-	-	-	-
-11	-	-	-	-
-10	1	,5	,5	,5
-9	1	,5	,5	1,0
-8	2	,9	1,0	2,0
-6	2	,9	1,0	3,0
-5	1	,5	,5	3,4
-4	9	4,1	4,4	7,9
-3	7	3,2	3,4	11,3
-2	8	3,7	3,9	15,3
-1	9	4,1	4,4	19,7
0	14	6,4	6,9	26,6
1	12	5,5	5,9	32,5
2	19	8,7	9,4	41,9
3	14	6,4	6,9	48,8
4	17	7,8	8,4	57,1
5	15	6,9	7,4	64,5
6	15	6,9	7,4	71,9
7				
10	4,6	4,9	76,8	
8	12	5,5	5,9	82,8
9	10	4,6	4,9	87,7
10	9	4,1	4,4	92,1
11	3	1,4	1,5	93,6
12	13	6,0	6,4	100,0
Total	203	93,1	100,0	
Missing	15	6,9		
Average	3.5764			

Table 4 shows the responses to each type of space on our list. Spontaneous comments received as we went through the list indicate that our respondents called to mind a number of aspects of each space as we mentioned it and weighed these against one another – the amounts and types of crime associated with different spaces, needs for protection against crime weighed against needs for protection against the gaze of strangers, availability of alternative crime prevention methods, property owners' rights and responsibilities, etc. Even with the help of these spontaneous comments, some of which we managed to write in the margins of the questionnaire, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to pick apart all the relevant aspects of urban spaces (relevant, that is, when it comes to public opinion of surveillance) working from the responses to our list of twelve. We had, however, prepared the list in advance to enable checking for three aspects: presumed ownership (traditionally public vs. privately owned spaces), presumed openness (open, high-usage spaces vs. intimate spaces), and for the intimate spaces the additional aspect of whether users might normally expect to be in a state of undress there.

If we group the spaces according to these characteristics, we find that responses differed from group to group. It seems to matter to our respondents whether a space is privately or publicly owned, wide open or intimate, and especially whether (as is the case for some intimate spaces) whether one might imagine being nude in such a place. Open streets, subway and railway platforms, and motorways are examples of publicly owned open spaces; shopping malls, shops, and banks are examples of privately owned public spaces. Hospital wards, public washrooms, and sports center changing rooms are (at least in Norway) examples of publicly owned intimate spaces; clothing store dressing rooms, taxis, and entrances to residences are privately owned intimate spaces. Of these intimate spaces, hospital wards, public washrooms, sports center changing rooms, and clothing store dressing rooms are places where one might be less than fully dressed. Sums of responses to the first four of these groups (public open, private open, public intimate, private intimate) can vary from -3 to +3; for the last (intimate where nudity normally occurs), from -4 to +4. Table 5 shows the distribution of responses for all five groups.

Table 4. Views on CCTV by types of places (in descending order according to acceptance of CCTV).

Type of place	% positive	% neutral	% negative	avg. respon.
Bank counters[5]	91.1	5.1	3.7	.8738
In shops[6]	84.6	12.1	3.3	.8131
Railw./subw. platforms	84.0	9.4	6.6	.7736
Passenger seats of taxis	72.3	16.0	11.7	.6506
Motorway	67.3	16.1	16.6	.5071
Street-like areas in shopping malls	64.2	20.8	15.1	.4906
Open street[7]	56.5	24.3	19.2	.3738
Entrances to residences[8]	45.5	22.5	31.9	.1362
Hospital ward corridors[9]	39.4	28.2	32.4	.0704
By sinks in public washrooms[10]	34.4	16.5	49.1	-.1462
Clothing store fitting rooms[11]	20.7	10.8	68.5	-.4789
Sports centre changing rooms[12]	16.5	18.4	65.1	-.4852

As Table 5 shows, while the majority answered on the positive end of the scale for open public and private spaces (77.5 and 92.4%, average response 1.6 and 2.2 respectively on a scale from -3 to +3), they were more sceptical towards surveillance of intimate spaces, be they public (42.6% negative vs. 44.6% positive, average response 0.1) or

[5] Man 60+: Yes, you have clothes on there [smiling].

[6] Positive: Boy 13-19 (druggie): Positive, because there's so much shop-lifting. Man 40-59 (from countryside): Tragic that it's necessary. Neutral: Woman 20-39: It's ok for shoppers, but maybe not for those who work there. Negative: Woman 20-39: They could have more mirrors instead, hire more staff.

[7] Woman 20-39: If they film at night when you're out on the town then that would be ok because there's always so much weird stuff going on.

[8] Woman 20-39: That would depend on where. Woman 20-39: I think the calling buttons should suffice.

[9] We specified the hallway, but people seemed to be visualizing patients' beds, perhaps because overflow patients are sometimes placed in the hallways. Some also differentiated between medical surveillance (sometimes ok) and crime prevention surveillance (inappropriate). E.g.: Girl 13-19: It would depend on how sick you are. If you're insane then it would be OK, but if you're dying of cancer, then I don't like the idea. Woman 60+: It depends on what the point is. To monitor patients' health would be ok, but I wouldn't want any criminality prevention going on in my bed!

[10] Positive: Woman 20-39: [after looking surprised] If there's somebody in the public toilets who shouldn't be there, then surveillance would be positive. Woman 20-39: There are other people in the room anyway. Negative: Boy 13-19: I'm against it there. You have to have some privacy too! Boy 13-19: Public washrooms? Why would they want to film us there?

[11] Boy 13-19: Oh, positive if I worked there – not! Man 20-39: No. That could be perverse idiots watching.

Woman 20-39: Filming someone who's changing is a bit over the line. Man 60+: That's getting close to the private sphere.

[12] Boy 13-19: That's a bit intimate, so there I would have to say I'm negative. Woman 20-39: No, excuse me, but that's somewhere I want to be alone! Voyeurism!

private (60.5% negative, average response -0.4), especially spaces where one might find oneself in a state of undress (64.9% negative, average response -1.1 on a scale from -4 to +4).

Table 5. Scale of responses regarding views on video surveillance in open public, open private, intimate public, and intimate private spaces and for intimate spaces where nudity is likely to occur.

scale values	open public		open private		intimate public		intimate private		intimate potentially undressed	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
-4,00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34	16,3
-3,00	3	1,4	3	1,4	25	11,8	18	8,6	26	12,5
-2,00	4	1,9	1	,5	27	12,8	24	11,4	53	25,5
-1,00	17	8,1	7	3,3	38	18,0	85	40,5	22	10,6
,00	23	11,0	5	2,4	27	12,8	28	13,3	24	11,5
1,00	37	17,7	35	16,5	40	19,0	21	10,0	15	7,2
2,00	36	17,2	38	17,9	23	10,9	12	5,7	13	6,3
3,00	89	42,6	123	58,0	31	14,7	22	10,5	4	1,9
4,00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	8,2
n=	209	100	212	100	211	100	210	100	208	100
Missing	9		6		7		8		10	
Avg.	1.6		2.2		0.1		-0.4		-1.1	

The public-private dimension in itself does not seem to matter for opinion on surveillance (61% vs. 59.3% respectively averaging positive answers), but interacts with the open-intimate dimension in that there is more acceptance of surveillance in open spaces that are privately owned and less acceptance in intimate spaces that are privately owned. This may reflect underlying values regarding private owners' rights to control access to and visibility within their own property: the right to watch over and intervene with strangers granted access and the right not to be watched oneself. It may also be an artifact of the particular spaces we chose to represent these dimensions as each space brings other features than ownership and openness/intimacy into play.

Table 6. Agreement/disagreement with positive/negative statements about video surveillance, ranked in order of % respondents supportive towards surveillance.*

Statement	% supportive	% neutral	% sceptical	average CCTV support
People who obey the law have nothing to fear from video surveillance. (agree = supportive)	67.1	15.6	15.1	+.52
Video surveillance is used to discriminate people on the basis of appearances. (disagree = supportive)	54.9	17.0	22.8	+.34
It would be acceptable to me to use hidden video surveillance. (agree = supportive)	41.3	20.7	38.0	+.03
Video surveillance is a poor substitute for more police in the streets. (disagree = supportive)	31.8	20.9	44.5	-.13
Video surveillance tapes can easily be misused. (disagree = supportive)	30.8	20.2	41.8	-.12
I would feel much safer if there were more video surveillance. (agree = supportive)	28.4	22.6	48.6	-.20
Video surveillance doesn't reduce crime; it just moves it elsewhere. (disagree = supportive)	28.3	31.1	35.8	-.08
Video surveillance prevents serious crime. (agree = supportive)	27.1	41.0	30.0	-.03
Video surveillance invades people's privacy. (disagree = supportive)	22.6	34.0	42.9	-.20
I would welcome video surveillance on the street where I live. (agree = supportive)	17.5	3.3	78.8	-.61

*) Values are recoded so that +1 (supportive) represents support for surveillance – agreement with a CCTV-positive statement or disagreement with a CCTV-negative statement, and -1 (sceptical) represents agreement with a CCTV-negative statement or disagreement with a CCTV-positive statement.

Question 6(a-j) in the survey was a series of ten statements about surveillance, gleaned from our own and others' earlier research. Five were formulated as positive towards surveillance and five sceptical. We asked our respondents whether they tended mostly to agree or disagree with each statement, were in between (neutral), or didn't know/couldn't answer. Here too we can sum the answers within the set as a general indicator of the level of acceptance of video surveillance. Positive answers to positive statements and negative answers to negative statements indicate support for

surveillance, and vice versa – negative answers to positive statements and positive answers to negative statements indicate scepticism or opposition to surveillance.

On the whole, responses to the positive statements averaged -0.2663, just slightly more negative than neutral, and responses to the negative statements averaged +0.1445, again just slightly more negative than neutral towards surveillance. In other words, our respondents tended on the whole to be a bit sceptical towards surveillance, indicating that their general support of surveillance earlier in the questionnaire is somewhat guarded or grudging – a necessary evil rather than a technology to be eagerly embraced.

Table 6 shows the distribution of responses to the individual statements. Here we show the statements in order of degree of respondents' acceptance/scepticism towards surveillance, beginning with those where most respondents voiced acceptance (i.e. agreed with positive statements or disagreed with negative ones) and ending where fewest voiced acceptance, rather than in the order they were given on the questionnaire.

As readers can see, only for three of these statements did more respondents voice acceptance of than opposition to video surveillance. Respondents were most likely to agree that "People who obey the law have nothing to fear from video surveillance"[13] and least likely to welcome video surveillance on the street where they lived. This seemed to be irrespective of **where** they lived, but often in comparison with some place where they imagined that surveillance might be called for. For instance, a young boy from central Oslo answered about his home street, "Nothing ever happens there." An older woman (60+) from a small city in Southern Norway said, "I'm glad I live on a street where that isn't necessary." And another older woman from a rural area said, "If I had lived in a city, then yes."

In retrospect, we see the responses to this entire list of statements as addressing issues of trust and suspicion. In general, people seem to trust surveillance operators to focus only on crime, not to discriminate on the basis of appearances[14], and therefore to be trusted even if the cameras are hidden[15]. However, they do not have all that much faith in the

13 Although a few did disagree, e.g.: Boy 13-19: Imagine if somebody saw your butt in a dressing room! Man 60+: One can get drawn into situations without having done anything wrong.

14 Although those who commented here seemed to see this more as a norm than necessarily as a general practice. For instance, one elderly woman said, "At least, they're not supposed to." Another elderly woman differentiated here between public and private operators: "Not public, but private ones, like in cafés". And those who themselves had experienced discrimination told long, irate stories, as in this exchange between two young adult druggies:

Woman 20-39: "Couldn't get into MacD's cuz of it. Junkies go into the railway station it doesn't take 2 minutes 'for they're chucked out by the guards."

Man 20-39: "Is that why we get chucked out?"

Woman again: "You kidding? Haven't you got that before now?"

15 Not that there weren't sceptical voices, e.g.: Woman 20-39: I don't like the idea of their being hidden. It has to be visible. I think that has a preventative effect too.

technology. Most respond that police in the streets would be better[16], video tapes can be misused[17], surveillance doesn't make us much safer because it displaces rather than reduces crime[18], and surveillance does represent an invasion of privacy[19]. Nor do they feel they need the technology close to home, since they trust their neighbours more than they trust strangers watching from behind a camera. In the next section we will explore the issue of trust a bit more.

3.2 It's a matter of trust ...

We will be exploring other aspects of the data in other contexts, but here we wish to take a closer look at indicators of trust. First, what do we mean by "trust" in this context?

In using the term "trust" we wish to focus on three issues: First – what the public thinks these systems and their operators are capable of doing and actually do, and second – whether they think these are worthwhile and acceptable things to do. In other words, can we rely on the systems and their operators to produce acceptable, worthwhile effects, and to avoid unacceptable effects, in urban spaces? And third – whom does the public trust and whom not? In other words, from whom and against whom do we feel we need protection?

16 E.g. Man 60+: "Police are the main thing!" But responses were not monovocal. There were those who disagreed. Some felt that cameras were not so much a bad replacement as a supplement: Man 60+: "Police can't be everywhere." Woman 60+: "It's not bad; it's a supplement." Woman 60+: "I don't want one or the other; Norway, rich as we are, should be able to afford both." And there were even a few who preferred cameras to police in the streets. E.g.: Man 40-59: "It's a good replacement." Man 20-39 (druggie): "I'd rather have cameras than police. Cameras don't haul you off to jail."

17 Here it seemed that those who disagreed more often felt they needed to explain why. For instance, one man, age 40-59, said that videotapes were not likely to be abused, at least, "Not if you follow the rules." In other words, he repeated his agreement that law-abiding citizens have nothing to fear from CCTV. One woman, 20-39, referred instead to the rules regarding CCTV procedures, saying tapes were not likely to be misused, "Not if they're in the right hands, not so readily in public agencies."

18 E.g. man, 40-59: "We've dreamed of that, but it doesn't happen." Woman, 60+, "It doesn't prevent it, but it makes detection easier."

19 Comments volunteered to this question were particularly revealing as to how different points of reference – geographically, experientially, and morally – were a basis for striking different points of balance between privacy and protection. E.g. girl, 13-19, "If it's in a residential area, then yes. If you're sun-bathing, for instance, then that would be totally wrong." Woman, 20-39, "It depends on where." Woman, 60+, "We have to accept a bit less privacy if we want to put an end to crime."

Technological potentials: the omnipotent or mysterious black box?[20]

Question 5(a-f) of our questionnaire was a list of technical capacities a video surveillance system might have. It could conceivably record images, be watched continuously on a monitor, be hidden, take close-up images, employ a facial recognition system, and/or record sound as well as images. We asked our respondents to make a guess, "If you had to guess, how many of the video surveillance cameras in this city would you say can ...".

These six items proved to take the most time most "don't know" answers, took longest time of all those on the questionnaire. They also required the most supplementary explanations and elicited the most "don't know" answers. We even had to rework our translation of one of the items from English to Norwegian. Most Norwegians had never heard of "facial recognition" (*ansiktsgjenkjenning*). When we met to sum up our first day of interviews, we worked out a standardized explanation for this item, wrote it on sticky-notes and each taped one into our questionnaire binder.

Table 7 shows the overall distribution of answers to this set of questions. As you can see, over half our respondents believe that most CCTV cameras in Oslo are being recorded on tape or disk; 17.1% believe they all are. For all the other potential capacities of CCTV systems, the majority of our respondents chose the safe answer "some". This can in many cases be another way of answering "don't know." Therefore, it is the more extreme response values that are most interesting:

Over 9% of our respondents believe that all the CCTV cameras in Oslo are zoom cameras, capable of taking close-up images; another 34.6% believe that most of them can. Nearly as many believe that all the CCTV cameras in Oslo can also record sound, although "only" under a quarter believe that most of them are so equipped. Over a third believe that most (30.9%) or even all (5.5%) of the cameras are being monitored in real time. Fewer respondents believed that the CCTV systems in Oslo are hidden (3.7% all, 24.4% most) or are equipped with facial or license plate recognition software (4.2% all, 17.1% most). Those last two capacities are also those for which the largest minority of respondents guessed that none of the CCTV systems in Oslo are so equipped.

[20] We realize that it may be stretching the concept a bit to discuss peoples assumptions about the technological capabilities of the system under the heading of "trust." After all, it is not clear whether systems are more to be trusted if they are technologically powerful or if they are not, as witnessed by these two spontaneous comments to the question of how many cameras the respondents thought had the capacity to take close-ups of people's faces:

Man 60+: They can't, but they ought to be able to.

Girl 13-19: I think that sounds yukkie.

Nevertheless, although the relationship between technological capability and trust is not in all opinions the same, there is always some relationship there.

Table 7: Percentage distribution of valid responses to questions 5a-f (N=218).

How many of the CCTV cameras in this city do you think:	All	Most	Some	None	Don't know
... record images on tape or disk	17.1	54.8	23.5	0.5	4.1
... are watched by someone at a monitor	5.5	30.9	58.2	0.5	5.1
... are hidden	3.7	24.4	58.1	8.8	5.1
... can take close-up images	9.2	34.6	50.2	2.3	3.7
... can automatically recognize e.g. faces	4.2	17.1	51.2	20.9	6.6
... can pick up conversation	9.0	23.6	56.2	6.1	5.2

How do these responses compare to system owners' and operators' reports to us earlier in our project? In work package 3 (Wiecek and Sætnan 2002b), we went door to door along about a mile of multi-use high street in Oslo[21], stopping at each address where there was public access to a ground floor space. At each such address, we asked and looked whether there were video surveillance cameras. We also looked to see whether there were signs notifying the public of the presence of cameras, and we asked employees and/or managers a number of questions about the capacities of their CCTV systems. We identified 78 CCTV systems along a central stretch of high street in Oslo, possibly the street with the highest density of CCTV systems in the entire country. At least 14 of these systems were not being recorded (owners of another 14 systems declined to answer that question). Only two of the systems were reported as being monitored 24/7, and another two as monitored continuously during daytime hours. Nearly half of the systems were monitored only occasionally if at all, and a few had no monitor whatsoever. Only three of the systems (for which the question was answered) had at least one pan-tilt-zoom or dome camera; most cameras were stationary with fixed focus. For 16 of the 78 systems we could not find any sign alerting the public to the presence of cameras, however none of these systems were hidden in any other sense of the word; we could readily see the cameras and in some cases the monitors were prominently on display. Of course, there may have been systems we did not find and that were not reported to us, but we doubt this. We did not ask whether the systems we saw had sound recording or pattern recognition, but we do know that the most

[21] And also in Copenhagen, but that is of less interest here.

technically and organizationally advanced of these systems in many other regards has neither. Thus it is unlikely that any systems in the city have either of these capacities.

The fact that many systems are neither taped nor monitored has been a matter of public debate in the past year. Thus it is somewhat surprising that any of respondents guessed that all cameras were so managed. Also for the other potential capacities of video surveillance systems, the public seems to have a somewhat exaggerated view of what existing installations can do.

This was especially true for the "scruffies" we interviewed. Part of the area where we conducted our interviews is notorious as being the street drug scene in Oslo. We conducted a few of our interviews on that corner of the square where the addicts and dealers hang out. We also interviewed some people in other parts of the square and indoors at the railway station who mentioned during the interview that they were or had until recently been drug addicts or alcoholics, or who quite obviously appeared so. In all 14 of our respondents were encountered as members of the drug scene or were very scruffy in appearance. Their responses to questions 5a-f exaggerated the capacities of CCTV systems even more than did the responses of the remaining public. This is shown in Table 8 below, and was also apparent in some of the unsolicited comments we noted while interviewing this group. For instance, when asked how many of the city's CCTV cameras he thought could take close-up images, one male addict answered "I could point to a dozen cameras right here that could look into your mouth and count your fillings!" We, on the other hand, knew of four cameras (out of a system of six) that could zoom in on us where we were standing. We were also aware that we were being watched then and there and knew the operators well enough to ask if they could copy out a snapshot of us from their tapes. Figure 1 is a scanned copy of the best image they managed to produce of us, even after asking us to move to a better spot where they could zoom in closer. In contrast, the scruffies' estimations of what these cameras can do seems exaggerated almost to the point of paranoia.

Table 8. Responses to questions 5a-f from 14 scruffy respondents.

How many of the CCTV cameras in this city do you think:	All	Most	Some	None	Don't know
... record images on tape or disk	5	6	3	-	-
... are watched by someone at a monitor	1	13	-	-	-
... are hidden	1	4	9	-	-
... can take close-up images	1	6	7	-	-
... can automatically recognize e.g. faces	-	2	8	3	1
... can pick up conversation	2	2	8	2	-

If the "scruffies" are somewhat paranoid about video surveillance, it may well be because they are persecuted. Our observations of control room activities in the same area where we have now conducted interviews showed that the scruffies are a primary target of surveillance here (Lomell, Sætnan and Wiecek 2003). For instance, they tend to get ejected from the adjacent shopping mall as soon as an operator sees them entering. So their "paranoia" may be a product of experience. It may be their personal experience of being watched that triggers their exaggerated impression of the power of CCTV-mediated vision.

Our earlier research (Lomell, Sætnan & Wiecek, op. cit.), as well as that of others (Norris & Armstrong 1999, McCahill 2002), shows that several social categories are statistically associated with a greater likelihood of being watched by CCTV staff. In addition to scruffies, men are more often watched than women, young more often than middle-aged or elderly, ethnic "minorities"[22] more often than members of the locally dominant ethnic group[23]. Are members of these categories aware that they are more likely to be

[22] We use "minority" here only partially in the numeric sense. While groups numerically in the minority also tend to be relegated to socially lower status, numerical minority groups may, in some locations, be socially dominant. And vice versa, groups numerically dominant in a given location may nevertheless be socially subjucated. We use "minority" here to refer to non-dominant groups, regardless of their numbers in a given location. Furthermore, for the questions discussed here, we employed respondents' self-identification as a basis for categorization. We asked, "Do you think someone seeing you only on a CCTV monitor would take you to be a member of an ethnic minority in this country?"

[23] Man 20-39(self-identified minority): After they showed CCTV tapes of a Vietnamese shoplifting league on TV I've felt that they were looking more closely at me. Sometimes it's really been the case and other times not.

watched? And if so, do they see it as affecting their behavior in areas under video surveillance? We had several questions to address these issues.

Figure 1. Image of the researchers taken by the nearest camera in one of the most powerful CCTV systems in Oslo.

Us or others? Who do we think is being watched?

Question 6 has been discussed above. As readers have seen, 67% agreed that "people who obey the law have nothing to fear from CCTV"[24] and 55% disagreed with the statement that "CCTV is used unfairly to discriminate on the basis of appearances."[25] Tables 9 and 10 show responses to these statements according to respondents' gender, age, minority self-identification, and for the group coded by us as scruffy. Only the "scruffies" show a radically different distribution of responses from the other groups. Men's responses are slightly more sceptical towards CCTV than women's, but the differences are not significant. The same is true for self-identified minority individuals relative to those who self-identify as visibly from the dominant ethnic group. Amongst age groups, the youngest and oldest tend most to agree that the law-abiding have nothing to fear, while young adults tend to disagree, but here too the differences are not

[24] One woman, 40-59, commented that "all the 'law-abiding' will believe that it's others who are targeted for surveillance."

[25] Furthermore, most who agreed with the statement disapproved. One exception was a woman, 20-39, who said, "It strikes me that while it's sad that they suspect certain types of people, at the same time it's safe."

(quite) statistically significant (p for χ^2=0.06). As for CCTV being used to discriminate, age is far from significant as an explanatory variable. For many questions, age was the only variable to show significant differences in responses, but these two questions are an exception.

Table 9. Agreement/disagreement with statement "People who obey the law have nothing to fear from CCTV cameras" by background variables

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don´t know	Total
Gender (sign of χ^2= 0.342)					
Male	72 (63.7%)	18 (15.9%)	22 (19.5%)	1 (0.9%)	113 (100.0%)
Female	71 (71.0%)	16 (16.0%)	11 (11.0%)	2 (2.0%)	100 (100.0%)
Age (sign of χ^2= 0.060)					
15-19	36 (66.7%)	8 (14.8%)	10 (18.5%)		54 (100.0%)
20-39	40 (54.8%)	17 (23.3%)	15 (20.5%)	1 (1.4%)	73 (100.0%)
40-59	34 (69.4%)	7 (14.3%)	7 (14.3%)	1 (2.0%)	49 (100.0%)
60+	33 (89.2%)	2 (5.4%)	1 (2.7%)	1 (2.7%)	37 (100.0%)
Self-identifies as apparent minority (sign of χ^2= 0.826)					
Yes	13 (56.5%)	4 (17.4%)	5 (21.7%)	1 (4.3%)	23 (100.0%)
No	123 (68.0%)	29 (16.0%)	27 (14.9%)	2 (1.1%)	181 (100.0%)
Maybe	6 (75.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)		8 (100.0%)
Appears scruffy					
Yes	4 (28.6%)	2 (14.3%)	8 (57.1%)		14 (100.0%)
Total	143 (67.1%)	34 (16.0%)	33 (15.5%)	3 (1.4%)	213 (100.0%)

Table 10. Agreement/disagreement with statement "CCTV is used unfairly to discriminate on the basis of appearances" by background variables.

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Don´t know	Total
Gender (sign of χ^2= 0.201)					
Male	30 (27.3%)	20 (18.2%)	53 (48.2%)	7 (6.4%)	110 (100.0%)
Female	17 (17.7%)	15 (15.6%)	60 (62.5%)	4 (4.2%)	96 (100.0%)
Age (sign of χ^2= 0.524)					
15-19	13 (25.0%)	13 (25.0%)	24 (46.2%)	2 (3.8%)	52 (100.0%)
20-39	16 (23.5%)	11 (16.2%)	36 (52.9%)	5 (7.4%)	68 (100.0%)
40-59	13 (26.5%)	7 (14.3%)	27 (55.1%)	2 (4.1%)	49 (100.0%)
60+	5 (13.5%)	4 (10.8%)	26 (70.3%)	2 (5.4%)	37 (100.0%)
Self-identifies as apparent minority (sign of χ^2= 0.486)					
Yes	8 (34.8%)	5 (21.7%)	10 (43.5%)		23 (100.0%)
No	38 (21.8%)	28 (16.1%)	97 (55.7%)	11 (6.3%)	174 (100.0%)
Maybe	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	6 (75.0%)		8 (100.0%)
Appears scruffy					
Yes	5 (38.5%)	2 (15.4%)	6 (46.2%)		13 (100.0%)
Total	47 (22.9%)	35 (16.6%)	113 (55.1%)	11 (5.4%)	206 (100.0%)

Another of the questions on our questionnaire was who respondents thought CCTV operators were looking for. Although we had some pre-coded categories for responses to this question, we did not read them out as prompts. Instead, we left the question hanging in the air for a few seconds and then crossed off and/or noted what categories the respondents themselves came up with. Most (83.4%) respondents mentioned theft as an action watched for and/or thieves as a category of people CCTV operators were likely to pay extra attention to. Most, in fact, mentioned only theft/thieves. Those who

did mention other categories of people or actions tended to mention many. Categories mentioned are listed in table 11 below. Note that one of the major response categories is the unprompted denial that operators look for anyone in particular on the basis of appearances.

Table 11. "In a shopping mall with CCTV, what do you think they are looking for on their cameras?" (multiple answers possible)

	N (Total = 205, 13 missing cases)	Percentage
Theft	171	83.4 %
Other behaviors	72	35.1 %
Ethnic minorities	72	35.1 %
Other appearances	47	22.9 %
Violence / threatening behaviour	45	22.0 %
Nervous/suspicious behaviour	42	20.5 %
Scruffies	41	20.0 %
Drugs / drug addicts	38	18.5 %
Gangs of youth	36	17.6 %
They don't look for anybody specific	34	16.6 %
Known criminals	22	10.7 %
Drunkenness	15	7.3 %
Pickpockets	13	6.3 %
Vandalism	11	5.4 %
Pretty women	11	5.4 %
Employees	11	5.4 %
Tagging	8	3.9 %
Rowdiness	8	3.9 %
Old people who steal	5	2.4 %
Vulnerable / frail	4	2.0 %
Begging	2	1.0 %

Keeping that caution in mind, our findings do to some extent support the panopticon hypothesis. While most of our respondents answered this question in the negative ("I can only be myself" was an answer that was repeated in many variations), this "most" was also mostly respondents in unmarked social categories – i.e. ordinarily dressed, Norwegian-looking, middle-aged men and women. A few, and almost only teens, minorities, and scruffies – i.e. members of social categories more likely to be targeted for

surveillance – answered something substantive to this question. Some answered that they avoided places with video surveillance, or even that they had no choice but to avoid them since they were promptly ejected if they tried to enter.[26] Some answered that they made an effort to clean up and appear sober.[27] And some, tongue in cheek, said they made a point of not stealing from shops with video surveillance.

Legitimate authorities: Who ought to be watching?

We also asked our respondents whether, given that they were in an area under video surveillance, they would feel most comfortable knowing that the cameras were being followed by someone watching at a monitor, recorded, both watched and recorded, or neither. Eleven respondents insisted that they would rather not be under video surveillance at all; 45 preferred monitoring only, 25 recording only, four said they would prefer a dummy system (cameras neither watched nor recorded, but visible as a crime deterrent) and five said they didn't know or couldn't choose among the alternatives; but, by far the majority (116) responded that they would prefer that the cameras be both monitored in real time and recorded.

Our next question was, given that they were in an area where cameras were monitored in real time, who would they feel most comfortable knowing was watching on the monitors – police, private security guards, shop owners or employees in the area, volunteer citizens, or some other category. Here the majority was marginally stronger yet (see table 12 below). Of 207 respondents who answered the question, 121 (58.5%) answered unequivocally that they would prefer having police watching the monitors. The next largest response group (32, or 15.4%) answered private security guards, but some of these volunteered the explanation that this was only because qualified police would be put to better use on other policing activities. Unfortunately, as is typical for questionnaire studies, not all respondents explained their answers, nor did we have the time to take notes on all explanations volunteered. Thus we cannot say how many of our respondents chose a "next-best" alternative response to this question. We can, however, say that all who volunteered that they were giving a "next-best" response, stated that police would have been their first choice.

[26] Woman 20-39, drug addict: "That's exactly why I don't go to malls much. Assault on my dignity. Strip searched and they don't find anything, but even so I'm banned for life. I can understand it in a way, but I still think there needs to be some discussion about it." Interestingly, this woman was nevertheless in favor of video surveillance on the grounds that it made her feel safer.

[27] Man 40-59, alcoholic: I pull myself together. If I didn't I'd get thrown out.

Table 12. "Given that you are in an area under monitored video surveillance, who would you feel most comfortable to have watching on the monitors?"

Response category	% of responses
Police	58.5
Private security guards	15.4
Volunteer citizens	6.9
Of these, private security or volunteers as next-best to police	1.9
Either police or private security guards	2.8
None of the above	1.8
Other[28]	4.6
Doesn't matter/all groups mentioned	4.6

All in all, we feel that these responses confirm what others have found in other contexts concerning public services, namely that Norwegians (perhaps naively) place considerable confidence in the State, and especially in its legal institutions, placing more trust in public than in market-regulated or volunteer-based services (Listhaug & Wiberg 1995). This faith is not, however, entirely "blind," as we shall see in the next section.

Watching the watchers: How we want surveillance regulated.

In spite of this dominant picture of trust in public authorities, our respondents were far from indifferent to means of controlling surveillance activities. Just after our question as to who respondents would feel most comfortable to have watching the monitors, we listed for them a number of proposed regulatory efforts and asked how important each of these was to them personally. With only one exception, each of these proposed rules elicited more support than did police as staff for surveillance monitors.

As not all respondents differentiated between "very important" and "somewhat important"[29] we have combined the two responses into a single response category. As table 13 shows, over 70% of respondents felt that each of the regulatory rules and practices proposed was important, with the single exception of rules restricting police access to recorded images.

[28] Typical responses that we coded as "other" or "doesn't matter" were people saying, e.g. "As long as they are public employees," or "As long as they have good training and are approved by the authorities." Public authorities mentioned as providing such approval were the police and the Data Protection Agency.

[29] Most simply said "yes" or "important". In our early interviews we asked respondents to qualify that answer further as "very" or "somewhat" important, but many declined or found it difficult to do so and some expressed impatience with the interview by that point, so we ceased to probe for further qualifications to responses to this set of questions.

Table 13. "A number of conditions/regulations have been proposed to control CCTV operations. In your opinion, how important are the following?"

proposed rule or regulatory practice	important	not important	don't know, no answer
clear and visible signage	80.7%	13.3%	6.0%
access to images taken of me	81.7%	12.4%	6.0%
restrictions on police access to images	48.2%	45.0%	6.9%
restrictions on media access to images	87.2%	6.9%	6.0%
restrictions on commercial actors' –"–	85.8%	7.3%	6.9%
time restrictions on image storage	73.4%	17.4%	7.8%
systems must be registered and approved	89.9%	2.3%	7.8%
systems must be subject to inspection	90.1%	1.8%	7.8%

The two regulatory practices that received by far the most support from our respondents were that all video surveillance systems should be registered and approved and subject to inspection from some public authority. All those who volunteered further comments here mentioned the Data Protection Agency as the authority they felt should be responsible for controlling video surveillance activities. So while the Norwegian public seems to trust public legal authorities in general, of these they trust the Data Protection Agency more than others. Looking back at all the questions examined so far, we could say that while the Norwegian public in general is favorable towards video surveillance and sees it as protecting their persons and property, their attitude is very much "Yes, but ..." They also see it as invading their privacy. Video surveillance still smacks of "Big Brother," and the Data Protection Agency is the public authority we have established to protect us from "Big Brother" growing too powerful.

3.3 It depends on who you ask ...

As mentioned above, one of our concerns regarding CCTV is that it might serve as a tool, or even an exacerbating factor, for appearance-based social exclusion from public spaces. We took some care, therefore, to include among our informants some who might represent various types of socially marginalized groups. In this context, these are groups that previous research had shown to be targeted for surveillance by operators either due to suspicions (e.g. "racial" minorities, young men, people with scruffy appearance) or for aesthetic reasons (i.e. young women) and/or singled out in surveillance discourse as potential benefactors (e.g. women, children, elderly, frail). In other words, their social marginalization takes on various forms, to which CCTV in turn can have different forms of relevance.

We will be conducting a more thorough analysis of responses from these groups in an MA thesis currently underway (Dahl forthcoming). Meanwhile, we will give below a cursory presentation of our findings.

Gender: Women are thought to be especially susceptible to masculine violence, especially sexualized violence, in public spaces. Our own study of media discourses showed that episodes of such violence (e.g. the rape and murder of two preteen girls, the kidnapping and attempted rape of a woman taxi driver) triggers demands for more video surveillance. A Danish opinion poll (*Berlingske Tidene* 2003) showed that women were more likely than men to agree that "video surveillance makes me feel safer."

Much to our surprise gender was not a significant variable to nearly any of the questions covered by the questionnaire. There are only a small handful of exceptions. Women are more negative to CCTV along motorways and taxi passenger seats[30], while men are more negative to CCTV at sinks in public toilets (perhaps because women are rarely unclothed near the sinks whereas men may be using urinals in that area).

Our in-depth interviews, however, do show that fear and danger are understood as gendered. Men are perceived as more dangerous than women, and as more dangerous to women than to men, as for instance in this exchange from one of the group interviews with children:

> Girl, 14: I'm only afraid when it's men, in a way. Like, if I see a scary man coming towards me and I turn around and another scary man is coming up behind me, then I think they're in it together. (Laughs) This is maybe a bit stupid.
>
> Boy 13: It could be women too, but that's, like, not so common. We've always heard that it's men who are bad and ...
>
> Boy 14: Women often have high-heeled shoes and that sort of thing, and they can't run so fast. So I could just outrun them.

Men are also perceived as less vulnerable, women more so. And women are perceived as more fearful in public spaces than men are and/or as more willing to admit to such fears. The following two quotes illustrate some of these features:

> Man, 55, about an area considered dangerous: Well, as a man in my prime, I guess I don't see it as all that scary to be there. It's probably not me it's scary for. (...) But I can readily understand if young girls or older women find it difficult to walk in some of these places. I don't find that hard to understand. Especially if they're walking alone.
>
> Woman, PhD student, 27: I think when I'm nervous it's largely because I'm a woman, because what I'm afraid of ... Because what I hear a lot about is women who are attacked sexually, and that's maybe what I'm most afraid of. So I think that's why, but in terms of robbery or that sort of thing I don't think there's much difference, unless you're a really muscular guy.

[30] This is, by the way, the opposite of what Statistics Norway found in 1997 (op. cit.).

It begs some explanation why this gendered sense of fear is so little reflected in gender-differentiated support for CCTV. One reason may be that it is counterbalanced by a fear of the voyeuristic male gaze and an identification of CCTV with just such a gaze. Perhaps women, though fearful, do not see CCTV as effective in protecting them. Perhaps since we interviewed in an area notorious as relatively dangerous we met women who were less fearful than most.

Age/generation: Similarly to the male/female dimension, young/old is seen as a social division between dangerous behaviors in the one group and physical weakness/need for protection in the other (but also, in the case of the very young, in the former). Here too, this dimension appears to be reflected in our statistics on targeted surveillance, with teenagers and young adults more often targeted than the elderly (Lomell, Sætnan & Wiecek 2003). Age has also turned up as a significant dimension in opinion polls of support for/scepticism towards CCTV.

Also in our own surveys age proved to be a very significant variable, but also one that will be difficult to interpret. In the Oslo data, the youngest age group is consistently the least positive towards CCTV, whereas in the data from Science Fair Day in Trondheim the opposite was the case. In Oslo the oldest were by far the most positive to CCTV; in Trondheim very few elderly visited Science Fair Day. In this report we will concentrate on the Oslo data. We plan to compare the two data sets more closely in the forthcoming MA thesis, but will give some general comments in the conclusions section concerning inconsistencies within our data sets and between our data and those of others before us.

The Oslo data is designed to allow grouping of potential CCTV settings so as to compare opinions along the dimensions open/intimate and public/private. In the category for open public places the youngest group is the group least positive to CCTV (62%) while the oldest are most positive (97%). The other groups line up neatly along the diagonal with 76% positive among respondents 20-39, and 80% of the group from 40-59. The children we interviewed were even more negative to CCTV in open public spaces than their contemporaries we encountered out in just such a space:

> Boy 14: I think cameras in streets are a bit unnecessary. And at least not in public places.
>
> Girl 13: They should maybe do something else than put cameras there and threaten us.

From the latter statement in this exchange it seems that teenagers, at least some of them, perceive CCTV as a weapon directed against them.

The category of open privately owned places was one category where the youngest age group was not the least positive/most sceptical. In fact 100% of both the youngest and the oldest age groups were on the positive side of the scale, as compared to 87.5% of the group from 20-39 and 86.3% of the 40-59-group. Age was not significant at the 0.05-level for this variable.

Differences between age groups for intimate public places are not quite at a 0.05 significant level either; significance of $\chi 2$ was 0.06. But here again the youngest group is the most restrictive to installation of surveillance cameras, as half of them are against. The other age groups are also a bit more negative than they were to CCTV in open public spaces (43.9%, 41.2% and 32.4% respectively from young adults to the elderly were opposed to CCTV in this group of settings).

Acceptance of CCTV increases with age for the intimate private places. 10% of the youngest group see CCTV in these places as a good thing, while 13.7% of the age group above, 29.6 of the 40-59 year olds, in sharp contrast to the 60+ group where 69.5% are positive. We wonder if the sharp differences in these spaces may have something to do with differences in experience. The elderly are less frequent users of, for instance, sports center changing rooms, than are teenagers and young adults, as expressed in the following two comments from questionnaire respondents:

> Man 60+:"I'm not so often in a sports centre changing room, so it's okay with me."

> Male 13-19: I'm against it there. You have to have some privacy too!

The youngest age group was by far the most negative to installation of cameras in to intimate places where nudity is likely to occur. 83.6% claim they are against installation of cameras here. Opposition decreases with age (70.8% of 20-39 year-olds and 60.8% of the 40-59 year-olds are negative). The group over 60 is the least sceptical to installation of cameras in these locations, as only 33.4% said they were negative to it. In addition to young people being more frequent users of, for instance, sports center changing rooms, we think they may also be particularly shy about being seen naked. In one exchange, a boy indicated that he thought this was especially important to girls, but we saw no gender differences in the questionnaire statistics on this point:

> Girl 13: 'Cause it's a bit yucky when you're in a fitting room and you just think about there being a camera there. There's probably nobody watching, but even so it's yucky.

> Girl 14: But when I see it [a CCTV sign in the fitting room of a store] I just think, OK, yeah. So I try on my clothes anyway. I don't think it's all that ... 'cause I don't really take it all that seriously.

> Boy 14: It must be kind of uncomfortable, for instance if you [turning towards the girls] are trying on a bra or something like that, then just ...Then like there are guys standing there watching you

Turning back to the elderly, it was among this group that we found the only respondents who were positive to CCTV in all 12 settings. Here we also found the most respondents who agreed with the statement "If everywhere was watched by cameras, I would feel much safer." One of our elderly respondents saw this as a response to a sense of frailty:

> Man 60+: Especially elderly people, of course. Assuming that it's monitored so they can intervene right there and then.

Minorities: Ethnic minorities are another social category repeatedly found to be targeted by surveillance operators. We used self-identification as a means of separating out responses from this group for comparison. We used the question: "Do you think someone seeing you on camera would categorize you as being from an ethnic minority in this country?" This formulation of the question points us directly at the panopticon hypothesis: The issue is not only whether a given person is in fact targeted for video surveillance, but also whether (s)he is aware of being targeted. It is that awareness that might, we hypothesized, lead to a different experience of surveillance and different opinions regarding its effectiveness and acceptability.

We surveyed 24 persons who self-identified as likely to be seen as non-Norwegians when viewed on a video screen. Surprisingly, there are only a few variables where this group differs significantly from the rest of the survey sample.

One of these variables is perhaps simply a random "hit" due to the total number of variables in the survey. After all, statistical significance is a question of probabilities. The more variables you have, the more likely it becomes that some improbably distribution will simply randomly occur. We have no other hypothesis as to why the self-identified minority group should object more than the rest of the sample to video surveillance at the sinks in public washrooms. Their answers do not differ from the sample as a whole for any other setting we asked about.

Three other differences are, however, easier to interpret. The self-identified minority individuals were less trusting of the police as surveillance operators. They, more often than others in the sample, preferred volunteer citizens as operators. They were also more suspicious than other groups in our sample as to how many surveillance cameras in Oslo were hidden. We think this may reflect that many immigrants to Norway, not least many refugees, have different experiences with and culturally contingent attitudes towards the police than do native-born citizens.

Another anticipated and confirmed difference in responses from this group as compared with the sample as a whole is that more respondents in this group, when asked who they thought surveillance operators looked for, spontaneously told anecdotes about racially discriminatory events. For instance, one Vietnamese man told of receiving more surveillance attention after a television news sequence showing surveillance footage of a group of (as it happened) southeast Asian shoplifters in action. And a Sudanese refugee told of an episode in a grocery store that he had found distressing: A black woman shopper had a small child with her. The child was complaining of thirst, so the woman gave the child a carton of juice from the shelf and put the empty carton in her cart to be paid for at checkout, whereupon a guard came and berated the woman for intending to steal the juice. Our informant felt sure that this would not have been assumed about a white woman who had done the same.

Many of our self-identified minority respondents (and a few non-minority respondents) told similar stories, but not all of them. Others responded, as did most in our sample, that they didn't think surveillance operators looked for anyone in particular. And when asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement "CCTV is used unfairly to discriminate on the basis of appearances," although we could see a tendency for our minority respondents to agree more frequently than others in the sample, the difference was not statistically significant (see table 10 above).

Scruffies: The drug addicts were one of the most obliging groups to talk to. As mentioned above, they were also in general very reflected on the area. Even though we interviewed only a small number of drug addicts it is clear they are more negative to CCTV, possibly (as one of them suggested):

> "Because I maybe so often do things that it's enough that just I know about, that I don't want others watching on video." (male, addict, age 40)

The addicts had also often experienced being harassed, with CCTV serving as a tool to make that harassment more effective.

But the addicts we interviewed also expressed an understanding for law-obeying peoples' positive views on CCTV:

> Man 20-39, addict: Because people who are crooks don't want surveillance at all, but I completely understand it if I were living a law-abiding life.

Some also expressed an appreciation of CCTV for their own sakes, saying that it had contributed to a reduction of violence within the drug environment and therefore gave them a margin of increased safety:

> Woman 20-39 (addict): In a place like this there is so much unprovoked violence. Safest [with CCTV] – at least for me who's a girl.

As with our age-related data, we have contradictory responses from this group, even from individuals within the group. We think this is not so much a flaw with the methodology as it is a reflection of the group having ambivalent feelings about CCTV.

4 Cautions and Conclusions: Findings from a closely watched space.

4.1 Cautions

Having presented the main strands of our results, the question remains: What do we make of them? What conclusions can we draw, including conclusions for policy discourses?

First of all, we have to confront the inconsistencies between our findings and those of others, including inconsistencies within our own data. We will be conducting closer analyses of our data in the coming months, including thinking long and hard about this issue, but already now we can discuss some of our thinking on the matter.

One direction we must examine is how methodological choices may have affected data outcomes. We have the impression that more negative opinions on video surveillance come forth in the in-depth interviews than in the survey data, and more negative opinions come forth in the survey data from Oslo than in our earlier survey at Science Fair Day in Trondheim. Honess and Charman (1992) found something similar when looking at differences in gendered opinion results when using different methods. In surveys conducted out in the street, men were more critical of surveillance than women, whereas in group discussions it was women who expressed greater scepticism. This is not quite what we found in our results, where there were few clear gender differences in any of our survey data, but clear gendering of space and fear in the interviews. Nevertheless, the underlying processes they postulate may help explain some of our own data inconsistencies. For instance, when interviewing in a heavily surveilled and also reputedly dangerous area, we may have met respondents who, regardless of age, gender, and other differences, were similarly unafraid of the area itself and at the same time accepting of the surveillance they encountered there. In contrast, when interviewing at the Science Fair Day, we met school groups – teachers and the children in their charge, many of the latter quite young and probably including children who were not accustomed to being in the city center on their own.

In our coming analyses, we may find it clarifying to weigh in the possibility that our informants out in the surveilled area may have felt more secure in such spaces than their demographic counterparts recruited them from their schools and offices. But on the other hand, far from all our informants express such feelings of security or fear themselves. Many of those we interviewed at school, in their offices, or at the Science Fair Day claimed to be quite comfortable and unafraid even in reputedly risky areas. And vice versa, some of our respondents in the field mentioned that they found the area unsafe. We will therefore also have to consider other possible explanations for inconsistencies in the data.

Another such explanation may lie in differences in the ways questions have been formulated. For instance, did we ask about the safety/danger of the space, or about the effectiveness of surveillance? And in the latter case, did we ask about surveillance in general, surveillance under (unspecified) ideal conditions, or surveillance as currently practiced? And did we note the first spontaneous answer, or did we allow time for ambivalence to be discussed? For instance, one interesting finding in our data is that though 61% of all respondents claim to feel safe in a surveilled area, none of the informants from the in-depth interviews really seem to find CCTV as very safety-promoting[31]. One girl responded to this question as follows:

> Interviewer: Do you think surveillance can make you feel safer?
>
> Girl 14: Yes, in fact. You could be filmed if someone strangles you ... [quiet for a few seconds]. But, actually, usually there's nobody watching the screen. They only see the film afterwards.

It is possible that when asked to comment a statement such as "I feel safe in places where there's video surveillance" (used on the questionnaire in Trondheim, see table 14 below), most people may assume they would feel safe, and therefore agree. But when they reflect a bit more on it, like the girl quoted above, they don't really think it gives them all that much security.

Table 14. Trondheim: "I feel safe in places where there's video surveillance" by age of respondent.

	Age			Total
	Under 20	20-39	40-59	
Fully agree	36,2%	12,2%	28,9%	29,5%
Somewhat agree	32,8%	30,0%	34,2%	32,3%
A bit of both	19,7%	32,2%	21,1%	22,8%
Somewhat disagree	7,4%	11,1%	5,3%	8,1%
Fully disagree	2,2%	11,1%	7,9%	5,0%
Don't know	1,7%	3,3%	2,6%	2,2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The findings to a similar question posed in Oslo are quite different, but then the formulation of the statement was also different: "If everywhere was watched by CCTV cameras, I would feel much safer." As table 14 shows, the youngest age group are the

[31] Most of our informants from the in-depth interviews mentioned other possibilities than CCTV to increase their feeling of safety. Some of the possibilities mentioned were better street lightening, more police officers and guards. This was also found by Sheila Brown (1999) when she did a study of CCTV and the gendering of public safety.

most negative to the statement. All of the explanations discussed above may apply, and then some. The youngest group in Trondheim includes respondents some years younger than those interviewed in Oslo. The children interviewed in Trondheim may be unfamiliar with the city center. They may be more fearful of it, and they may also have less experience with CCTV. If so, they may have little idea of what CCTV implies, perhaps also little sense of safety from it.

In Oslo, the group over 60 were less present out in the surveilled area. This was the age group we had the greatest difficult to get to recruit for the survey, not least as they were just not in the area. We had to move inside the railway station building in order to recruit more elderly respondents. It is also possible that the elderly are the group that feels the most need for protection and want to believe in it. It is possible that their sense of fear is greater than others'. Old people may feel frail and may be convinced that we live in a dangerous society. As one of our elderly interview respondents said, "*There is so much strange stuff going on these days that one ought to have surveillance everywhere. One isn't safe anywhere."* (Woman, over 60). At the same time, however, she said that she doesn't notice if she's in an area under surveillance, so she doesn't know where surveillance is today. That means it might make her feel safer when the subject comes up, but it's not something she thinks about or uses consciously. Young people are more used to society as it is today, they have never experienced anything else. It is possible that because of this they don't feel they need CCTV to protect them.

We could continue this close analysis of inconsistencies in the data ad infinitum, but for now we let this brief discussion suffice as a caution for our readers and ourselves. The data should not be considered a straightforward measure of public opinion, but must be interpreted in light of possible effects of the methodologies chosen.

4.2 Conclusions

We are intentionally cautious in this report as we will be conducting further analyses of our data in the coming months. However, we do see one complex social process emerging here that we wish to point out already now.

Our data show that most people in Norway, and especially those in unmarked social categories (working aged, not scruffy, members of dominant ethnic group as far as appearances go), are fairly supportive of CCTV and trusting of CCTV operators. They largely share the conviction that "if you have nothing to hide, then you have nothing to fear from CCTV". Most of them are also convinced that CCTV operators do not discriminate on the basis of appearances.

But our data also show that in fact, CCTV operators do discriminate on the basis of appearances. Young, minority-appearing men and scruffies are much more likely than others to be targeted by surveillance. If surveillance is at all effective in detecting crime, then young, minority-appearing men and scruffies are also much more likely than others

to be caught if and when they conduct any criminal activities in an area under surveillance. Young, minority-appearing men and scruffies are therefore also likely to be overrepresented in crime statistics, thus confirming the appropriateness of discriminatory surveillance. And if "we" (the comfortable majority) see that "they" (young, minority-appearing men and scruffies) are targeted by surveillance, are ejected from publicly accessible spaces by security guards, are prominent in crime statistics – then won't this further entrench our cultural assumptions about young minority men and scruffies as "others," as dangerous individuals whose exclusion from "our" social spaces is entirely self-inflicted?

In extension of this, we are also concerned that publicly accessible spaces will thereby become "ghettoized," will come to be populated by an ever-narrower spectrum of society. Societies need meeting places. If we are to build cosmopolitan societies, societies rich in cultural impulses, societies where democracy is secured by mutual trust amongst social groups with diverse interests and perspectives, then we need those meeting places to be diversely populated. Even if social isolation in the short term can provide some degree of protection (and we have not demonstrated that it does do that), in the long term it might weaken social cohesiveness, exacerbate intergroup differences and increase the potential for intergroup conflicts.

We wish to bring this issue of social exclusion to the forefront of debates on CCTV. This issue is not just about fairness, though it is definitely also about that. It does not preclude debates about invasion of privacy, but instead interacts with privacy issues in that the privacy of some is invaded more than that of others. And it is not an issue of interest only for the minority few; it is an issue that concerns us all.

5 References

Aftenposten 2001/4/2: "To av tre godtar videoovervåking"

Berlingske Tidene, 2003/01/19: "Danskernes syn på TV-overvågning", "Danskerne siger ja til skjulte kameraer" and "Danskere: Mere overvågning"

Brown, Sheila (1998): "What's the problem, girls? CCTV and the gendering of public safety". Pp. 207-220 in *Surveillance, Closed Circuit Television and Social Control*, edited by C. Norris, J. Moran and G. Armstrong. Aldershot: Ashgate.

The Crime Prevention Council in Denmark [Det Kriminalpræventeive Råd] (2000): *CCTV Surveillance. Between prevention and privacy. A booklet for debate from the Danish Crime Prevenition Council on attitudes to and experience with CCTV surveillance*, Copenhagen: The Danish Crime Prevention Council.

Dahl, Johanne Yttri, Ann Rudinow Sætnan, Heidi Mork Lomell and Carsten Wiecek (2003): "Peekaboo! Children's perspectives on video surveillance." Paper presented at *European Sociology Association*, Murcia, 23-27 September.

Davies, Simon. G. (1999): "CCTV: a new battleground for privacy" pp. 243-254 in *Surveillance, Closed Circuit Television and Social Control*, edited by C. Norris, J. Moran and G. Armstrong. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Foucault, Michel (1977): *Discipline and Punish. The birth of the prison*. New York : Vintage

Fox (2001): "Someone to watch over us: Back to the Panopticon?" *Criminal Justice*, Vol. 1, no. 3, pp 251-276

Fyfe, Nicholas R. and Jon Bannister (1996): "City watching. Closed circuit television surveillance in public spaces." *Area* 28, pp 37-46.

Hannah, M. (1997): "Imperfect panopticism: Envisioning the construction of normal lives." pp 344-359 in: *Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity.* Ed by G. Benko and U. Stohmayer. Ocford : Blackwell

Herbert, S. (1996): "The geopolitics of the police: Foucault, disciplinary power and the tactics of the Los Angeles Police Department." *Political Geography*, 15, Pp 47-59

Hirsch, Andrew von and Clifford Shearing. (2000): "Exclusion from public space." in *Ethical and social perspectives on situational crime prevention*, edited by A. v. Hirsch, D. Garland and A. Wakefield. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Honess, Terry and Elizabeth Charman. (1992): *Closed circuit television in public places : Its acceptability and perceived effectiveness*. London: Home Office Police Department : Police Research Group.

Koskela, Hille. 1999. *Fear, control and space: Geographies of gender, fear of violence, and video surveillance*. Helsinki: Department of Geography, University of Finland.

Listhaug, Ola and Matti Wiberg (1995) "Confidence in Political and Private Institutions." Pp 298-322 in *Citizens and the State. Beliefs in Government* Ed by Hans-Dieter Klingemann & Dieter Fuchs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 298-322.

Lomell, Heidi Mork, Ann Rudinow Sætnan and Carsten Wiecek (2003): *Flexible technology, structured practices: Surveillance operations in 14 Norwegian and Danish organisations*. UrbanEye: Working Paper No. 9. (http://www.urbaneye.net/results/ue_wp9.pdf)

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

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

Soja, Edward W. (1996): *Thirdspace: Journeys to Low Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell

Statistics Norway (1997): Undersøkelse om personvern 1997. In: *Ukens statistikk nr. 39*, 1997 http://www.ssb.no/emner/00/01/30/persvhold/

Statistisches Bundesamt: *Eurostat Database New Cronos*

Taylor, Nick (2002): "State surveillance and the right to privacy" pp 66-85 in *Surveillance & Society*, 1 (1).www.surveillance-and-society.org

Wakefield, Alison. (2000): "Situational crime prevention in mass private property." in *Ethical and social perspectives on situational crime prevention*, edited by A. v. Hirsch, D. Garland and A. Wakefield. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Wiecek¸ Carsten and Sætnan, Ann Rudinow (2002a): *Restrictive? Permissive? The Contradictory Framing of Video Surveillance in Norway and Denmark*. Urban Eye project, Working paper No.4 from wok package 2, Legal framework and current debate. Trondheim. (www.urbaneye.net/results/ue_wp4.pdf).

Wiecek¸ Carsten and Sætnan, Ann Rudinow (2002b): *Geographies of Visibility. Zooming in on Video Surveillance Systems in Oslo and Copenhagen*. Urban Eye project, Working paper No.5 from wok package 3, Locations and actors. Trondheim. (www.urbaneye.net/results/ue_wp5.pdf).

6 Annex: Norwegian version of the questionnaire

Meningsmåling om videoovervåkning

Vi holder på med et forskningsprosjekt om videoovervåkning av offentlige steder. Vi prøver å finne ut hva befolkningen synes om slik overvåking. Er du villig til å delta i meningsmålingen? Det vil ta ca. 10 minutter.

1) For det første ... Hvor godt kjenner du det området hvor vi nå står?
O Er her daglig O Passerer/besøker ofte O Er her i blant O Første besøk/turist

2) Tror du dette området er videoovervåket?
O Ja O Nei

3) Dersom du svarer ja: Kan du peke ut hvor nærmeste kamera er?
O Nærmest O Annen i nærheten O Bommer O Svarer nei
[Vi peker så ut nærmeste kamera og noterer evt. kommentarer/reaksjoner]:

_____

4) Hvilke andre steder har du sett overvåkningskameraer her i byen? [noter første spontane svar, så gå over til liste]. Vi har en liste på 13 typer steder der overvåkingskameraer kan finnes. Synes du det ville være overveiende positivt, både postivt og negativt eller overveiende negativt om de fantes der?

Først spontant		Positivt	Både/og	Negativt
O	A. I butikker i sentrum	O	O	O
O	B. I drosjer	O	O	O
O	C. På T-bane-/togplattformer	O	O	O
O	D. I treningsgarderober	O	O	O
O	E. I prøverom i klesbutikker	O	O	O
O	F. Ved bankskranker	O	O	O
O	G. Utendørs i handlegater	O	O	O
O	H. I sengeposter på sykehus	O	O	O
O	I. Langs motorveier	O	O	O
O	J. Ved vaskene på off. toaletter	O	O	O
O	K. I fellesarealene på kjøpesentre	O	O	O
O	L. Ved boliginnganger	O	O	O
O	Andre			

_____

5) Hvis du måtte gjette, hvor mange av videoovervåkningssystemene her i byen ville du si:

	Alle	Fleste	Noen	Ingen
A. Blir lagret på enten videokassett eller computer-disk?	O	O	O	O
B. Har folk som følger med på overvåkingsbildene ved en skjerm eller monitor?	O	O	O	O
C. Er skjult slik at vi ikke ser at vi blir filmet?	O	O	O	O
D. Kan ta nærbilder av folks ansikter?	O	O	O	O
E. Automatisk kan gjenkjenne folk eller bilskilt?	O	O	O	O
F. Kan lagre både lyd og bilder?	O	O	O	O

6) Jeg har en liste med noen påstander vi har møtt i vår forskning. Jeg vil gjerne vite om du er *stort sett enig*, *både enig og uenig, eller stort sett uenig* i forhold til hver av dem.

	Stort sett enig	Både/og	Stort sett uenig	Vet ikke
1. Folk som er lovlydige har ingenting å frykte fra videoovervåkning.	O	O	O	O
2. Det er greit å bruke skjult videoovervåking på offentlige steder.	O	O	O	O
3. Videoovervåkning invaderer folks privatliv.	O	O	O	O
4. Jeg ville gått inn for videoovervåking i gata der jeg bor.	O	O	O	O
5. Videoovervåkning reduserer ikke kriminalitet; det bare forflyttes til andre steder.	O	O	O	O
6. Videoovervåking er en dårlig erstatning for mer politi i gatene.	O	O	O	O
7. Videoovervåkning forhindrer alvorlig kriminalitet.	O	O	O	O
8. Opptakene fra videoovervåkning kan lett bli misbrukt.	O	O	O	O
9. Videoovervåkning brukes til å diskriminere på grunnlag av folks utseende.	O	O	O	O
10. Om alle steder var videoovervåket ville jeg føle meg mye tryggere.	O	O	O	O

7) Når du går i et område som dette, føler du deg mest vel ved:
O Et overvåkingssystem der en operatør følger med på en skjerm og der bildene lagres?
O Et overvåkingssystem med lagring, men uten operatører som følger med?
O Et overvåkingssystem der en operatør følger med på en skjerm, men der bildene ikke lagres?
O Et "liksom"-system som ser ut som kamera men som verken blir fulgt med på eller lagret?
O Ingen videoovervåkning i det hele tatt.

8) Sett at du går i en gate der det finnes videoovervåking der noen følger med på en skjerm. Hvem føler du deg mest vel med skal følge med på skjermene?
- O Politiet
- O Private vekterfirma
- O Eiere/ansatte i forretningene langs gata
- O Frivillige borgere
- O Andre (hvem:) _____
- [O Ingen av disse. Jeg ser helst at det ikke overvåkes i det hele tatt.]

9) Det er blitt foreslått en rekke tiltak/reguleringer for å kontrollere videoovervåkning. Etter din mening, hvor viktige er følgende – *svært viktig*, *litt viktig*, *ikke viktig*?

	Svært viktig	Litt viktig	Ikke viktig
A. Tydelige og synlige skilt så jeg vet når jeg er i et overvåket område	O	O	O
B. Rett til innsyn i personopplysninger samlet om meg, inklusiv bildedopptak.	O	O	O
C. Restriksjoner på hvorvidt opptak kan gis videre til politiet.	O	O	O
til media	O	O	O
til kommersielle interesser	O	O	O
D. Tidsbegrensninger på hvor lenge billedopptak kan lagres.	O	O	O
E. At alle overvåkningssystemer må registreres og godkjennes.	O	O	O
F. At alle overvåkningssystemer kan inspiseres.	O	O	O

10) I et kjøpesenter med videoovervåkning, hva tror du de ser etter på sine skjermer? [Noter kun spontane svar. Spør deretter om det er noe annet adferd, andre utseende resp. tror de ser etter, men les ikke hele lista.]

A. Adferd, så som:
   - O butikktyveri
   - O lommetyveri
   - O tagging
   - O tigging
   - O støyende oppførsel
   - O vold eller truende adferd
   - O sjangling
   - O annet: _____

B. Utseende, slik som:
   - O folk som ser skitne eller fillete ut
   - O ungdommer i flokk og følge
   - O etniske minoriteter
   - O folk som ser ut sårbare og svakelige ut (f.eks. syke, gamle)
   - O pene damer
   - O andre: _____

11) Påvirker dette hvordan du selv oppfører deg på kjøpesenteret?

A. Ja:
   På hvilken måte:_____
B. Nei:
   Fordi:_____

Til slutt trenger vi litt bakgrunnsdata om alle som svarer. Dette er data vi bruker for å gruppere svar under analysen:

Kjønn	O Gutt/Mann	O Jente/Kvinne		
Alder	O 13-19 år	O 20-39 år	O 40-59 år	O 60 eller mer
Utdanning (høyeste fullført til nå)	O grunn-skoleelev	O fullført grunnskole	O fullført videregående	O fullført høyrere utd.

Utseende: Tror du at noen som ser deg på en overvåkingsskjerm vil tro at du tilhører en etnisk minoritet i Norge? O Ja O Nei

Vi skal også foreta ca. 10 intervjuer med et utvalg brukere av byrommet. Vi vil spørre disse om hvordan de bruker byen – hvor de går, når på dagen/uka, for hvilke typer aktiviteter; også om hvor de føler seg trygge, hvor de føler seg mer utsatte, og om videoovervåkning spiller en rolle for dette. Et intervju vil ta ca. en halv time, avhengig av hvor mye du selv vil fortelle.
Kunne du tenke deg å delta i et slikt intervju? I så fall vil vi trenge å kontakte deg for å avtale tid og sted. Vi noterer navn og telefonnummer på et eget ark, slik at dette spørreskjema forblir anonymt.