

Street drinking legislation, CCTV and public space: Exploring attitudes towards public order measures

John Dixon, Mark Levine and Rob McAuley

On-line report, 2003

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Professor Martin Gill (Perpetuity Research and Consultancy International) and Professor Terry Honess (City University) for acting as independent assessors for the report.

We would also like to acknowledge the assistance a number of people. In particular, we wish to thank our respondents and interviewees for providing the data for the research. We would also like to thank Graham Cox, Head of City Council Property Services in Lancaster, for several helpful discussions about the role of CCTV surveillance in the city. Finally, thanks are due to Anna Richardson, Tracey Budd and Siobhan Campbell of the Research, Development and Statistics Directorate of the Home Office for their encouragement and guidance.

Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	2
Executive summary	4
1. Introduction	5
Aims and rationale	8
Structure of the report	8
Previous research	8
Background and methodology	9
2. Attitudes towards public drinking and public drinking legislation	10
Knowledge of the byelaw	10
General attitudes to street drinking and the byelaw	10
Who supports the byelaw and why	12
Attitude to public drinking and feelings about social inclusion	13
Level of place identification	14
Summary	15
3. Attitudes towards CCTV in Lancaster City Centre	16
Awareness of CCTV systems	16
General attitudes to CCTV	16
CCTV and beliefs about effects on crime, safety and individual rights	18
Who supports CCTV and why	18
Place identification and attitudes to CCTV	20
CCTV and feelings about social inclusion	20
CCTV and social responsibility	20
Summary	21
4. Comparing attitudes to public drinking measures and CCTV in city centre and residential locations	23
Attitudes to CCTV/drinking measures by city centre and residential locations	24
Summary	25
5. Implications for policy and practice	26
Policy context of the research	26
Evaluating the impact of CCTV and drinking measures	27
Environmental and social impacts of CCTV and drinking measures	28
Appendix A Survey questionnaire	29
Appendix B Methodology	38
Appendix C Interview schedule	39
Appendix D Additional tables	40
References	44

Executive Summary

This report presents findings of how members of the public understand and evaluate two measures designed to promote public order: street drinking bans and CCTV surveillance. Both measures have become increasingly prevalent in British cities over the past twenty years. However, evidence about their perceived impact remains somewhat fragmented. The research findings provide further information to inform the debate about how the public views increasing surveillance and restrictions.

The research was situated in the city of Lancaster, located in the north west of England. CCTV surveillance has been deployed in Lancaster since 1996, and since 2000 the city centre has been subject to a street drinking ban. Using a telephone questionnaire survey (n=808) and follow-up interviews (n=59), the research explored how local residents evaluate both kinds of measure. The key findings are presented below under the relevant chapter headings.

Attitudes towards public drinking and public drinking legislation (Chapter 2)

- There was a moderate level of concern about public drinking with 45 per cent of respondents agreeing that groups of people drinking alcohol in the streets made them feel anxious and almost half agreeing that all public drinking should be banned.
- Residents held moderately favorable attitudes about the role of street drinking legislation in promoting public safety and reducing crime. Older respondents and women were more supportive of street drinking bans than younger respondents and men.
- Street drinking bans were seen as most useful in improving the look and feel of the town centre and in reducing the sense of threat felt by vulnerable residents.

Attitudes towards CCTV in Lancaster town centre (Chapter 3)

- Attitudes towards CCTV surveillance were more positive than attitudes towards street drinking legislation. Older respondents and women were more supportive of CCTV surveillance than younger respondents and men.
- CCTV was successful in promoting feelings of safety with little evidence that it impinged on the individual. Eighty-four percent of respondents felt that CCTV cameras were effective in cutting crime, over 60 per cent felt they made them feel safer in the town centre and only ten per cent felt they infringed their individual rights.
- Data from the qualitative interviews suggests that there may be qualifications to this support. Some interviewees suggested that although they understood the benefits of CCTV they felt it was a necessary evil and was a sad reflection on society.

Comparing attitudes towards public drinking measures and CCTV in city centre and residential locations (Chapter 4)

- Support for street drinking bans and CCTV surveillance was higher when they were situated in city centre rather than residential locations.
- Public drinking measures in residential areas were the least supported initiative as they were seen to have little impact on public safety and to make an unwarranted intrusion on civil liberties.
- Support for both CCTV and street drinking measures was associated with attitudes towards social inclusion. Respondents who supported CCTV surveillance and street

drinking bans were more likely to believe that other individuals or groups should be excluded from town centres.

- There was some evidence to suggest that attitudes to CCTV may be related to feelings of personal responsibility for the welfare of others. One interpretation of this is that those who favoured CCTV surveillance were less likely to worry about or intervene to help others in the town centre.

Policy Implications of the Research

- Any attempt to create 'no alcohol' zones in residential areas, rather than in town or city centres, may require particularly careful consultations with local residents.
- A focus on 'crime reduction' may not always be the best way to assess the impact of CCTV and drinking measures. People are equally concerned with the appearance and atmosphere of public places. Thus, greater emphasis should be given to the impact on quality of civic and social life in future evaluations of public order legislation.
- There may be tension between policy initiatives aimed at increasing social inclusion and initiatives aimed at increasing public order. The most marginalised members of society (eg. rough sleepers, people with mental illnesses, the young unemployed) are often most visible in public places. At the same time, a function of CCTV and drinking bans could be to remove groups who make public places look more unsightly and feel less orderly. As a result it is possible that the people we are encouraged to include in society are likely to be those we exclude through increasing emphasis on public order initiatives. Currently, the emphasis tends to be on crime reduction elements of public order, it may be time for policy makers to think about the promotion of social inclusion as an important indicator in its own right.
- The research points to the potential for some unintended consequences of the spread of CCTV surveillance. One possible interpretation of the findings is that as it becomes more and more routine for public spaces to be watched by cameras, so we may come to feel less personal responsibility for what happens in those public spaces. More research is necessary to support this and to explore the issue in more depth, but potentially, policy makers need to recognize that the proliferation of CCTV technology may gradually weaken people's sense of civic responsibility towards one another.

1

Introduction

The past few decades have witnessed a proliferation of two kinds of interventions for promoting public order in UK cities.

First, there has been an exponential growth in usage of CCTV technology. Since 1999, the Government has provided £170 million funding for over 600 public space CCTV systems in towns, cities and rural areas.

Second, in an attempt to control alcohol-related crime and disorder, over 100 local authorities set up 'alcohol free zones' (Home Office, 2001), establishing byelaws to prohibit the public consumption of alcohol in specially designated streets, squares, parks and other public areas. This trend has recently been facilitated by provisions within the Criminal Justice and Police Act of 2001, which built upon the experience of local authorities who had previously adopted the model byelaw. Primary legislation, in the form of designation orders, now exists which allow local authorities to designate public areas where it will be an offence for any person to drink alcohol after being required by a police officer not to do so. The Act also makes provision for police to confiscate alcohol in these areas. It is envisaged that designation orders will make the process more straightforward and ensure greater consistency throughout the country. As of July 2003, 75 local authorities had published designation orders.¹

This report describes a research project that investigated social attitudes to CCTV and public drinking interventions in the city of Lancaster in the North West of England. Using a combination of questionnaire and interview data, the project explored how local residents understand and evaluate the role of these public order measures.

Aims and rationale

This report attempts to extend current knowledge about social attitudes to CCTV and street drinking measures in a number of ways.

- First and most straightforward, the research was designed to enrich the existing descriptive literature on how ordinary people understand and evaluate these public order measures. Given the limited amount of published research on the topic, evidence about public perceptions of street drinking as a social problem and drinking byelaws as a solution is perhaps especially valuable. By the same token, it is now a decade since Honess and Charman (1992) completed the first comprehensive study of attitudes to CCTV systems in England: Have attitudes towards the use of surveillance cameras changed in the intervening years and if so how?
- Second, as subsequent chapters will elaborate, the study was designed to explore a somewhat wider range of social and psychological correlates of attitudes towards public order interventions than have featured in most previous research. For example, are such attitudes associated with individuals' willingness to accept social diversity in public areas or feelings of responsibility for others' welfare? Does an individual's degree of attachment to, or pride in, a place predict whether or not they support measures designed to promote public order there? In addressing such issues, the study sought to develop a somewhat broader conception of the role of public order technologies in everyday life, to consider their implications not only for crime prevention but also for civic and public relations more generally.

¹ Further information about Designation Orders can be found at:
<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/alcoholorders01.htm>

- Third, the study aimed to compare attitudes towards public order measures across two types of public space, that is, city centre and residential spaces. Although CCTV and public drinking measures are presently concentrated in city centre areas, they are being extended into other kinds of spaces. CCTV installations in particular are a highly adaptable mechanism for monitoring and regulating social behavior whose extension to other areas of social life seems to be imminent. For instance, in Lancaster, where the present research was conducted, cameras already operate in and around local estates such as the Ridge Estate and Ryelands Estate.

Structure of the report

The remainder of this chapter provides some further information about this study and places it in the context of existing research. Following on from this:

- **Chapter 2** provides descriptive statistics on attitudes towards public drinking and legislation designed to curb public drinking in Lancaster City Centre. It also identifies some demographic and social factors that seem to predict attitudes towards street drinking measures.
- **Chapter 3** provides descriptive statistics on respondents' attitudes towards CCTV measures generally and in the context of their implementation in Lancaster City Centre. It also identifies some demographic and social factors that are associated with attitudes towards CCTV surveillance.
- **Chapter 4** compares social attitudes towards CCTV and street drinking measures across two kinds of public space, residential public space and city centre public space.
- **Chapter 5** offers a discussion of some of the main findings and suggests some policy implications of the research.

Previous research

The majority of existing research on CCTV has focused on its efficacy as a tool of crime reduction, (see for example Tilley, 1993; Painter and Tilley, 1999) The resulting evidence has suggested a rather complex picture and produced mixed results. CCTV has been found to work well in specific contexts such as car parks and when well monitored. However, there are gaps in the evidence base which it is hoped will be addressed through the forthcoming CCTV national evaluation. Rather than directly considering its consequences for crime prevention or detection, the present research investigated the public understanding and evaluation of CCTV, an issue that has generated relatively little previous research. Honess and Charman's (1992) study remains one of the most significant contributions to this topic, though several more recent studies have also yielded valuable data (see e.g. Short & Ditton, 1996; Ditton, Short, Philips, Norris & Armstrong, 1999). This research has indicated that CCTV is generally well supported by members of the public, even by individuals and groups who perceive themselves as targets of surveillance (c.f. Short & Ditton, 1998). Equally, however, disquiet remains about some of the technology's social and political consequences, notably its potential for violating individual privacy and related rights. Moreover, public understandings of CCTV seem to vary considerably according to the context in which they are framed. Ditton (1998), for instance, noted that if questions are framed in a context of crime prevention then support for CCTV runs as high as 95 per cent. However, if the same questions are framed in a context of civil liberties, then support drops to around 56 per cent. One of the objectives of the present research was to explore this kind of attitudinal complexity and variability.

Research on social attitudes to public drinking remains limited. Certainly, the available evidence on public perceptions of street drinking legislation is sparser and more fragmented than the evidence on public perceptions of CCTV. The most substantive study to date on the consequences of such measures to is Ramsay's (1990) Home Office

funded project entitled 'Lagerland Lost'. Among other issues, Ramsay investigated longitudinal shifts in public perceptions of crime in Coventry, one of the first UK cities to establish alcohol free zones. His results suggested that local residents were highly knowledgeable about the existence of the drinking byelaw and that the overwhelming majority of them (over 90 per cent) supported its implementation. Furthermore, following the institution of the street drinking ban, there was a decrease in the number of respondents who perceived public drinking to be a social problem in Coventry and a reduction in their sense of 'fear' when visiting the city centre (see also Ramsay, 1989). At the same time, however, Ramsay found little evidence that the ban had actually reduced levels of 'criminal victimization' (defined in terms of rates of assaults, muggings and so on), suggesting that the benefits of street drinking measures may be as much psychological as objective. Indeed, reviewing crime statistics in Coventry before and after the introduction of the byelaw, Marsh and Kibby (1992) concluded that "...while the regulations may reduce the incidence of drinking in the street, and subsequently the classification of an offence as drink-related, they do little or nothing to inhibit disorderly behaviour (p.58)." Qualifying this trend, however, public drinking measures have been cited as a contributing factor to a drop in crime in Manchester city centre (Institute of Alcohol Studies, 2001).

Research in other cities has confirmed that street drinking measures tend to receive a positive evaluation from members of the public, although there is considerable variation in levels of knowledge and perceived efficacy. Interpreting this pattern, Ramsay (1991) has identified a number of factors that are crucial to the successful implementation of street drinking measures. Notably, he argues that such measures must be well publicised and applied to regions of cities that are clearly and coherently demarcated. As important, they must rigorously and consistently enforced by the local authorities. Under such conditions, byelaws may reduce the visibility of street drinking and thus increase the public's sense of safety, albeit "...at a small cost in terms of a limited restriction on personal freedom..." (Ramsay, 1991, p.18).

Background and Methodology

Research context

The research was conducted in the city of Lancaster, which is situated in the North West of England. Lancaster is a relatively small city, with a population of around 130,000. At the city's heart lies two public squares, namely Dalton Square and Market Square, and the streets that surround these squares constitute the main shopping and night-time economy regions. The Market square area was particularly important to the design of the present research. Not only did it feature in several of the survey questions asked of respondents, but it also provided the context in which follow up interviews were gathered. Reasons for giving this area of the city such prominence in the research were threefold. First, Market Square is the focal point of the local community. Lying at the heart of the city, it houses important services such as the library, the museum and the Food Market and acts as a meeting place for diverse groups of residents. Second, Market Square is one of main areas of the city in which street drinking has historically occurred, a point raised in several of the local council meetings held in 1999, when the possibility of a street drinking ban was discussed. Finally, Market Square is a space in which both CCTV surveillance and a ban on street drinking are currently applied. In other words, it is a region where the measures investigated in this research are being used in combination to promote public order.

CCTV cameras were first installed in Lancaster in 1996; and there are now a total of 39 cameras in the local district, divided roughly equally between Lancaster and Morecambe. Three of these cameras monitor activities in Market Square. As a result of their successful application in the latest round of the Home Office Funding initiatives, the local council plan to increase the number of camera installations in the immediate future. A byelaw to prevent people from drinking alcohol in public places in Lancaster and Morecambe was first mooted in a series of local council meetings in 1999, and it was introduced in the middle of 2000. The byelaw effectively covers the entire city centre and is publicised by a number of strategically placed signposts.

Method

In order to explore social attitudes towards CCTV and the public drinking ban, we gathered two kinds of data. The primary source of data was derived from a telephone survey, and this survey was complemented by a series of semi-structured interviews.

The telephone survey employed a questionnaire (see Appendix 1) that measured a number of variables related to the study's research questions, including:

- General levels of concern over street drinking
- Perceptions of the drinking byelaw's impact on individual rights, safety and crime in Lancaster city centre
- Perceptions of the byelaw's potential impact on rights, safety and crime if extended to cover residential areas of the city
- General attitudes towards CCTV
- Perceptions of the impact of CCTV in Lancaster city centre on individual rights, safety, and crime rates
- Perceptions of the impact of CCTV if extended into residential areas of the city
- Level of place identification, notably with the Market square area of the city centre
- Attitudes towards social diversity in Lancaster city centre.
- Perceptions of personal responsibility for others' welfare in the city centre

Further details of the survey methodology are provided in Appendix 2.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted between March and August 2002. The interviews were designed to supplement the quantitative survey data, providing insight into the motivations underlying respondents' attitudes towards public order measures. The interview schedule thus encouraged respondents to elaborate their understanding of the role of CCTV and street drinking initiatives in Lancaster City Centre (see Appendix 3).

Interviews were conducted with a total of 59 respondents, a sample comprising roughly equal numbers of five sub-groups of users of the square; that is, teenagers, mothers with children, homeless people/travellers, commercial workers and the elderly. The majority of the interviews lasted between 15 minutes and one hour and took place with individuals or small groups of respondents who were present in Market Square at one of three time slots, 10am-12pm, 12pm-2pm, 2pm-4pm. This *in situ* approach was helpful in several respects (e.g. it produced some vivid, contextually rich and naturalistic accounts) but it did lead to some technical problems. For example, background noise in the square sometimes reduced the audibility of taped conversations.

Notwithstanding this problem, all interviews were transcribed in preparation for thematic analysis. Given the relatively small sample involved, caution should be taken not to generalise on the basis of this analysis. The interviews are better treated as a supplement to the main survey data; they are useful in illustrating, clarifying and sometimes qualifying the quantitative trends identified in the telephone survey.

2 Attitudes towards public drinking and public drinking legislation

This chapter has two objectives. First, drawing on the survey data and the interviews, it will describe respondents' attitudes towards the ban on street drinking in Lancaster city centre. Second, it will discuss several factors that emerged as significant correlates of those attitudes, including gender, age, level of place identification, tolerance of social inclusion and level of concern over public drinking.

Knowledge of the byelaw

To begin with, however, it is worth considering the extent to which the respondents in Lancaster were aware that street drinking legislation has been implemented in the city centre. In order to address this issue, the survey asked 'Do you know whether or not a ban exists on drinking alcohol in public in Market Square?' 59 per cent of respondents (n=478) answered 'yes' to this question, 16 per cent (n=126) answered 'no', and the remaining 25 per cent (n=204) answered 'don't know'. Thus, just over half of respondents surveyed displayed awareness that a drinking byelaw had come into effect. This level of knowledge is somewhat lower than that reported in some earlier surveys where public awareness has tended to range around 80 per cent and in one instance reached as high as 93 per cent (c.f. Ramsay, 1991).

General attitudes to street drinking and the drinking byelaw in Lancaster

Public concern over street drinking

The survey used seven questions to measure concern over public drinking (see Table 2.1 for the questions and percentage of people who agreed with each question). Answers to these questions suggest that most people were moderately concerned about public drinking. The average score for all seven questions taken together was just over the mid-point (3.08) on a scale where 1= not at all concerned and 5 = very concerned. However, some questions indicated particular areas of anxiety. For example, 46 per cent of people agreed with the statement 'When I see a group of people drinking alcohol in public streets, I feel anxious', and almost half agreed with the statement 'All drinking of alcohol in public places should be banned'. In contrast, only 23 per cent of people agreed with the statement 'Drinking alcohol in public streets is just harmless fun'

Table 2.1 Concern for Public Drinking

Questions	Percentage of people who agree (%)
'Drinking alcohol in public streets is harmless fun'	23
'All drinking of alcohol in public streets should be banned'	48
'As long as they are not causing trouble, people should be allowed to drink where they like'	35
'People who drink alcohol on the street are a menace to society'	27
'Its anti-social to drink alcohol on the street'	39
'A ban on drinking alcohol on public streets restricts people's freedom'	39
'When I see a group of people drinking alcohol in public streets, I feel anxious'	46

Note: percentage agreement scores indicate the proportion of respondents who either agreed or strongly agreed with each statement.

Attitudes towards the drinking byelaw

Three survey questions directly assessed public attitudes towards the new byelaw, with respondents being asked to rate its impact on crime, safety and individuals rights respectively. In each case, attitudes were measured on five point scale where 1 = a very negative attitude to the byelaw and 5 = a very positive attitude to the byelaw. Generally, the results revealed a moderate level of public support for the drinking ban in Lancaster city centre, with average scores for both perceived impact on safety (3.38) and effectiveness² (3.57) falling about one point above the scale mid-point. Moreover, although 21 per cent of respondents perceived the new byelaw as a potential violation of their individual rights, 69 per cent of those surveyed either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this notion, with the remainder of the sample being undecided.

These survey results were echoed by the interview responses, most of which supported the byelaw, portraying it as an attempt to 'clean up' the city centre. Explaining her support for the ban, for example, one participant noted:

'I think it [public drinking] brings the tone of a place down. I'm not being snobby but it does. These gangs of lads walking around with cans of beer you know, and you trying to do your shopping and just have a nice afternoon...' (40 year old, woman).

Another developed this theme:

'It's ugly to look at, it's a litter generator, it's a source of trouble is drink isn't it? I'm not against drink incidentally, when I say this. But these people who drink in Market Square, they're drinking through habit. They're not drinking socially really. They're just drinking for drinking sake and I think that's bad. So I do think the ban is direct towards getting rid of those people and making it more pleasant for people like me. Do I think it will affect me? Yes I do. There's no drinkers here today. Therefore it has affected me for the better this drinking ban' (60 year old man).

Several interviewees, however, raised questions about the byelaw's efficacy, arguing that public drinking was still in evidence or that the police were not pursuing convictions vigorously enough:

² It is worth noting that only 23 per cent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the drinking byelaw had been effective in reducing crime in Lancaster city centre. The same figure was reported in Ramsay's (1990) study in Coventry

'I remember the other day. They was all in that far corner with their dogs and they was there for about three hours. I never saw any police anywhere...[.]. but as I say the other day there was them. You know I don't know what they call these people here all this here iron and safety pins and coloured faces. Well they would go in that corner and nobody come to them. I mean there was some lads there that tried drinking white lighting, you know the cider, and they were off their head..... '(80 year old man).

'I mean we used to get the drunks lined up on those steps there every day and you could not move on those steps. But they've gone now. Where they are, I don't know. I don't know. There are probably quite a few of them knocking about, but it would appear that it's been effective in some way, though I'm pretty certain there've been no convictions. And now the police, I don't know, they don't seem as though they want to enforce it' (50 year old man).

Others questioned the ban's effectiveness on the grounds that it did little to stop heavy drinking within the city's various bars and nightclubs, thereby doing little to address the main cause of public disorder. Taken as a whole, the survey and interview data suggest Lancaster residents express qualified support for the byelaw.

Who supports the drinking byelaw and why?

As outlined in the introduction, the survey questionnaire was designed to measure the relationship between attitudes towards street drinking legislation and a number of other social and demographic variables. The objective here was to explore the kinds of social and psychological factors that are associated with public support for public order initiatives such as public drinking byelaws. In this section, we present the results of the relevant analyses.

Concern with public drinking: Perhaps not surprisingly, significant correlations were found to exist between concern over public drinking and perceptions of the drinking byelaw in Lancaster city centre. In general, the higher respondents' level of concern over street drinking, the more positively they tended to rate the byelaw's impact on crime and safety and the less likely they were to perceive the byelaw as a violation of their individual rights (see Appendix D, Table A1 for table of correlations).

Age and Gender: Two demographic variables were significantly associated with attitudes towards the street drinking ban in Lancaster. First, older respondents tended to display higher levels of support for the drinking byelaw than younger respondents, a relationship that was significant for ratings of effectiveness against crime and for promotion of public safety (see Appendix D, Table A2 for table of correlations). They were also less likely than younger respondents to perceive the byelaw as a violation of individual rights. This pattern was confirmed when the sample of people in the survey was divided equally into four separate groups, ranging from the youngest to the oldest. As Table 2 (below) shows, the average score for each age group on each question increases with age. In other words, the older the age group the greater the support for the drinking byelaw.

Table 2.2 Average attitudes towards public drinking and the impact of public drinking legislation as a function of age

Age group	Effects on Safety	Effects on Crime	Effects on Rights	Concern over public drinking
Less than 35 yrs	3.07	3.38	3.27	2.7
35-46 yrs	3.26	3.37	3.52	2.87
47-60 yrs	3.41	3.61	3.70	3.21
Greater than 60 yrs	3.82	3.92	4.01	3.59

Note: Scores on each scale can vary between 1 and 5, with higher scores indicating greater support for street drinking measures and greater concern over street drinking.

The importance of age as predictor of social attitudes was confirmed by the interview accounts collected in Market Square. In several of these accounts, middle-aged and elderly respondents spoke at some length about what they perceived as an historical decline in public order in Lancaster.³ For example, they contrasted the current high incidence of public drunkenness and associated infringements such as littering with the relative absence in previous times.

'...I've sort of lived in Lancaster all my life and I'm 50 years old. I'd like to and having seen times when I could walk through the night safely, now I can't. You know it just isn't safe and people are out of control. Drinking is normalised, heavy drinking is normalized' (50 year old man).

In addition to age, gender was also an important demographic variable in predicting support for the drinking byelaw. As can be seen in Table 2.3, women expressed significantly greater concern than men about public drinking, as well as a somewhat more positive attitude towards the street drinking byelaw. Note, though, that these gender differences were small in magnitude and only ratings of the 'personal rights' item reached statistical significance. Thus, one should be cautious about making strong claims about the gulf between men's and women's perceptions. Having said that, as the next chapter will show, analysis of attitudes towards CCTV technology showed a similar pattern of gender differences. This might indicate the possibility of a wider tendency for women to support public order initiatives more strongly than men. This tendency would be consistent with the literature in criminology and human geography, which has sometimes indicated that women feel more vulnerable than men feel in the public sphere (e.g. Day, 1999), even though their actual risk of violent attack in public is generally lower than that of men (Mirrlees-Black, Budd, Partridge and Mayhew, 1998)

Table 2.3 Gender differences in concern about public drinking and perceived support for the drinking byelaw

Attitude scale	Men	Women
Overall concern over public drinking	2.97	3.15*
Perceived impact of byelaw on safety	3.30	3.43
Perceived impact of byelaw on crime in city centre	3.53	3.59
Perceived impact of byelaw on individual rights	3.51	3.69*

Note: Scores on each scale can vary between 1 and 5, with higher scores indicating greater support for street drinking measures and greater concern over street drinking. * mean difference = $p < .05$. Significance was tested for using standard t-tests

Attitudes towards public drinking and feelings about social inclusion

Two questions in the survey were designed to measure attitudes towards social inclusion in public spaces. The first question asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they agreed with the statement 'Some people should be kept out of the Market Square area of the city centre'. The second question asked them to state how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the statement 'A good mix of people use the Market Square area of the city centre'. Answers to both questions were measured on a five point scale, with higher scores interpreted as indicating more inclusive attitudes as regards the diversity of users of Market Square. These items were included in order to test the hypothesis that people who are concerned about the social diversity of public space are also concerned over the problem of public order and thus hold more positive attitudes towards practical measures to improve public order.

Statistical analysis provided some support for this hypothesis (a complete table of correlations can be found in Appendix D, Table A3). Firstly, the more concerned respondents were about public drinking, the less they agreed with the statement that a 'good mix of people used Market Square' and the more they believed that 'some people should be kept out of the Square'. Secondly, the stronger respondents' belief that some

³ Note, however, that one 80 year old respondent argued precisely the opposite. He suggested that street drinking had always been a problem in Lancaster and that violent and disorderly behaviour were more prevalent in the past, when organized street fights used to occur in the city centre.

people should be kept out of Market Square, the more favourably they rated the byelaw's effects on public safety, crime and rights although there was no relationship between these measures and the statement 'a good mix of people use Market Square'. Some of the implications of these findings will be revisited in Chapter 4. However, it is worth noting here that they are open to a number of possible interpretations. On the one hand, they may suggest that an intolerance of diverse, inclusive public spaces is associated with support for public order measures, which may be perceived as removing the 'wrong' sort of people or activities from such spaces. On the other hand, the items designed to measure social inclusion in this study may be measuring a related construct such as fear of crime.

Level of place identification

A final step of the analysis examined the relationship between respondents' identification with place and their attitudes towards public drinking legislation.⁴ As mentioned in the introduction to this report, identification with a place – defined as the extent to which individuals experience a sense of pride, belonging and identity there – may predict support for social policies designed to improve or upgrade that place (c.f. Bonaiuto, Breakwell & Cano, 1996). Our data yielded only limited support for this idea however. That is, we found only one significant result, a small positive relationship between respondents' identification with Market Square and their tendency to agree that the byelaw had increased their feelings of safety (see Appendix D, Table A 5). Generally, then, the survey data did not support the notion that place identification is a good predictor of attitudes towards public drinking legislation.

The interview data, by contrast, suggested that individuals' concerns over public drinking often centred on their perceptions of its impact on the aesthetic, social and civic qualities of Lancaster City Centre. In particular, as some of the interview extracts previously cited demonstrate, the negative 'visual' impact of street drinking was a recurring theme in the interview data. Several interviewees mentioned that street drinking, whilst not a serious or dangerous offence per se, contributed to the visual degradation of Lancaster City Centre. In addition, interviewees often mentioned that the tendency for drinkers to congregate visibly in particular settings in the town square -- notably the Library steps and around the fountain -- deterred other people from making full use of these settings and thus limited the public accessibility of services. Explaining why he supported the byelaw, for instance, one 30 year old local man observed that:

'It has changed because there was quite a few winos that were sitting round here normally but I think since they've banned drinking from all the area they've moved them out, I don't know where but it seems a lot better because you can see a lot more public. When the winos were sitting round there you wouldn't see this lot sitting round here. You'd see the winos plus a few people that's it, but not like this...[.] In fact they won't come near the Square itself but now since the winos have been moved or moved on you get more public in the Square, sitting down' (30 year old man)

Summary

This chapter has described social attitudes towards public drinking and legislation implemented to curb public drinking in Lancaster City Centre. It has also explored some of the social and demographic variables that may be associated with such attitudes. The main findings can be summarised as follows:

- Lancaster residents displayed fairly low levels of knowledge about the existence of the public drinking byelaws in the town centre, (about 41% of respondents were unsure of whether or not a byelaw applied to the Market Square area or thought one didn't exist).

⁴ The place identity measure was a composite score derived from the average of 5 individual items. The internal consistency of the scale was reasonable (alpha = 0.72).

- Residents displayed moderate levels of support for public drinking legislation. Ratings of its perceived consequences for public safety and crime reduction averaged just above the mid-point of scales.
- Finally, the most important correlates of attitudes to public drinking measures included the gender and age of respondents, attitudes towards whether people should be excluded from certain public spaces in the city centre and level of concern over street drinking.

3 Attitudes towards CCTV in Lancaster town centre

This chapter will explore respondents' attitudes to CCTV surveillance in general and their beliefs about the role of CCTV in Lancaster city centre in particular.

To help enrich our understanding of respondents' general attitudes to CCTV, the chapter will compare current findings with the findings of the last major quantitative survey on attitudes to CCTV carried out by Honess and Charman (1992) just over a decade ago. However, it is important to note that there are limitations to the conclusions that can be made on the strength of such a comparison for several reasons. Different sampling procedures and data collection methods were used in the two studies. Whereas Honess and Charman undertook face-to-face interviews in four cities this study used telephone surveys in one city. Furthermore, the context of the research was not the same across the two studies and there is a gap of more than ten years between them. Finally, assumptions have been made about how Honess and Charman analysed their data, and therefore it cannot be guaranteed that the current study replicated their analyses. Consequently, although it is an interesting exercise to compare the findings of the two studies, conclusions about whether the public's perception of CCTV has changed over the last decade, based solely on this analysis, should not be made.

The chapter will also consider the respondents' attitudes towards the role of CCTV in Lancaster town centre, focusing on its perceived effect on crime reduction, public safety, and civil liberties. The chapter will then discuss several factors which emerged as correlates of those attitudes, including age, gender and tolerance of social inclusion. Finally, the chapter will conclude by exploring some of the attitudes associated with CCTV systems, including the lower levels of reported feelings of responsibility for others and the decreased likelihood of helping in public places.

Awareness of CCTV systems

However, before we do so, it is important to take a measure of the general levels of awareness of CCTV systems in Lancaster amongst our respondents. Overall, in answer to the question 'Have you noticed CCTV cameras in Market Square?', 40 per cent of respondents answered 'yes' with 54 per cent of respondents answering 'no'. The remainder of respondents were unsure. While knowledge of the presence of CCTV seems somewhat low, this figure compares favourably to Honess and Charman (1992) who reported knowledge levels of 35 per cent for street CCTV systems amongst their respondents. In common with Honess and Charman, we also found a significant gender difference in awareness of CCTV with men saying they were more aware of the system than women (49% compared to 32%)

General attitudes to CCTV

Our measure of general attitudes to CCTV was taken from the scale validated by Honess and Charman (1992).⁵ By using this scale we were able both to assess current levels of support for CCTV in Lancaster and to gauge whether there are any substantial differences to the findings reported by Honess and Charman a decade ago.

As can be seen from Table 3.1, levels of general support for CCTV are high. Only a small percentage of respondents would like to see the cameras banned and two thirds of people think that the more CCTV cameras we have the better. There is strong support for the idea that if you obey the law or are not a criminal then you should have nothing to fear from the cameras. Emerging findings from the public attitude component of the forthcoming national evaluation of CCTV also found a high level of support for CCTV in

⁵ Information about the reliability and validity of this scale can be found in Honess and Charman (1992)

both town and city centres and residential areas (86% vs 82%), amongst those who were not aware of any current CCTV coverage in their area (The Scarman Centre, forthcoming).

When it comes to the question of whether CCTV surveillance should be covert or whether people have the right to know about surveillance, respondents are divided. Just over half support the use of hidden cameras, but a similar number endorse the importance of the right to know if they are being watched. Opposition to CCTV cameras, as measured by concerns over the invasion of privacy or distrust of those who control the cameras, are expressed by about 20 per cent of the sample. When the issue of the potential abuse of CCTV is considered, levels of concern rise, with 58 per cent of respondents agreeing that the cameras could be used by the wrong people.

Table 3.1 CCTV scale item scores for current study and Honess and Charman (1992)

Item	Current Study	Honess and Charman (1992)
'It would be okay to use hidden CCTV cameras'	56% agree	59% agree
'People have the right to know when they are being watched by a CCTV camera'	59% agree	60% agree
'People should always be told by a large notice when such a camera is being used'	48% agree	60% agree
'CCTV camera are really spy cameras and should be banned'	7% agree	11% agree
'CCTV cameras could be used and abused by the wrong people'	58% agree	72% agree
'The people who control CCTV cameras cannot be trusted to use them only for the public good'	22% agree	38% agree
'CCTV cameras invade peoples privacy'	21% agree	36% agree
'The more of these CCTV cameras we have the better'	24% do not agree (66% agree)	36% do not agree (No info)
'In the future, CCTV cameras will be used by government to control people'	32% agree	37% agree
'People who obey the law have nothing to fear from CCTV cameras'	85% agree	No info
'Only criminals have any reason to be afraid of CCTV cameras'	78% agree	No info

Note: To produce the figures for our data we have collapsed together the categories 'agree' and 'strongly agree'. Honess and Charman do not say whether the same is true for the data they report. We assume they did so.

In general, the pattern of results are not substantially different to those found by Honess and Charman (see Table 3.1). Although, on almost every item for which data is available⁶, our findings reveal less concern (or perhaps more support) for CCTV amongst the current sample than that identified by Honess and Charman 10 years earlier. Worries over invasion of privacy seem lower, as do the level of distrust of those who control CCTV systems. Similarly, concerns that the wrong people could use the cameras is also lower.

⁶ Honess and Charman give extensive detail on the construction and validation of their scale. However, they do not report the individual item analysis in the main body of their report. We have extracted what information is available and used it to structure the description of our data.

Support for the proliferation of CCTV cameras is greater, while the number of people in favour of a complete ban on CCTV cameras is somewhat lower. It seems that in the decade since Honess and Charman's report (and the increasing penetration of CCTV into both the public realm and public consciousness) those in the Lancaster sample appear less suspicious and more accepting of CCTV systems.

CCTV and beliefs about effects on crime, safety and individual rights

Not surprisingly, there was a strong relationship between the general attitude to CCTV and beliefs about the role of CCTV in the town centre: 84 per cent of respondents felt that CCTV cameras were an effective way of cutting crime in Lancaster; 64 per cent felt that the CCTV cameras made them feel safer in the town centre; while only ten per cent felt it infringed their individual rights. The more favorable respondents' attitudes to CCTV in general, the more they felt CCTV was effective against crime in the town centre; the safer CCTV made them feel in the town centre; and the less they felt it infringed their individual rights (see Appendix D, Table A1 for a table of correlations).

These findings are consistent with findings from the forthcoming national CCTV evaluation (The Scarman Centre, forthcoming). The national evaluation found a similarly high level (79%) of agreement that 'with CCTV the level of crime would go down' and 17 per cent agreed with the statement that 'with CCTV there would be an invasion of privacy'.

Qualifying support for CCTV

Despite these high levels of support in the survey data, the interviews indicate that support for the cameras may be more qualified. Interviewees tended to support the cameras with an air of resignation. Some felt that the cameras didn't really impinge on their lives and that the declining state of society meant that the cameras had become necessary.

'I suppose they're necessary nowadays. I can't say as they ever bother me. I mean I've never really noticed them to be there to be honest. I suppose they do have their uses, vandals and so on. Don't bother me. I say a necessary evil, yeah I do really I mean, I, you know, tend to, myself tend to believe in almost absolute freedom for everybody that everyone shouldn't really be monitored in what they do but as I say but if they do help to make places feel safer or whatever then it's hard to avoid them really to be honest' (21 year old man).

What seemed to characterise expressions of support for CCTV amongst our interviewees was their recognition of a dilemma at the heart of the surveillance regime. In order for CCTV to work, interviewees had to become objects of surveillance. Sometimes this surveillance had positive effects in that it could protect them and their property. At other times this surveillance was an unwelcome intrusion on their right to privacy.

'I think it's a two sided thing for me. If they were used for the safety and security of residents in area and were monitored properly and consistently then you know, I wouldn't mind them, I mean I'm not a criminal so therefore I don't have to worry about cameras. It's not nice to be watched. Anyway if whether you're a criminal or whether you're not a criminal it's not nice to feel that some days you don't know who's looking at you going about your ordinary business' (40 year old man).

Who supports CCTV and why?

Age as a predictor of attitudes to CCTV

Analysis revealed that, like the street drinking ban, age was a significant predictor of both attitudes to CCTV and beliefs about the role of CCTV in the town centre. Correlation analysis suggested that the older the respondent, the more favourable the general attitude to CCTV, the more CCTV is seen as effective at cutting crime in the town centre, the more CCTV makes people feel safer in the town centre, and the less CCTV is felt to restrict individual rights (see Appendix D, Table 2 for a table of correlations). This age

effect is made clearer when the survey respondents are divided into four equal sized groups, increasing with age (see Table 3.2, below). Statistical analysis of the average scores for these different groups shows that those aged under 35 are significantly less favourably disposed towards CCTV on both general and specific attitudes than all the other groups. The age groups above 35 all share similar levels of support for almost all elements of CCTV. The only difference is to be found in the general attitude scale, where the over 60's are the most favourably disposed to CCTV. In general terms, in the Lancaster sample, support for CCTV is significantly lower among the under 35's than any other age group.

Table 3.2 CCTV and beliefs about CCTV in the town centre as a function of age⁷

Age Group	Effects on Safety	Effects on Crime	Effects on Rights	General attitudes to CCTV
Less than 35 yrs	3.28*	3.87*	3.56*	3.10*
35-46 years	3.71	4.11	3.93	3.42
47-60 years	3.76	4.18	4.08	3.45
Greater than 60 yrs	3.75	4.15	4.04	3.63*

Note: Scores on each scale can vary between 1 and 5, with higher scores indicating greater support for CCTV. *= $p < .05$. Significance was tested for using standard t-tests

Gender as a predictor of attitudes to CCTV

Some gender differences in attitudes to CCTV also emerged from our analysis. On the general attitude scale, women were significantly more favourable to CCTV than men (see Table 3.2) although both men and women scored above the midpoint on the scale indicating a favourable overall orientation to CCTV. Women were also less concerned about the impact of CCTV on individual rights. There were no significant gender differences for the other questions.

Table 3.3 General attitudes and beliefs about impact of CCTV as a function of gender

Attitude Scale	Men	Women
Overall Attitude to CCTV	3.31	3.43*
Perceived impact of CCTV on safety in city centre	3.56	3.63
Perceived impact of CCTV on crime in city centre	4.04	4.09
Perceived impact of CCTV on individual rights	3.79	3.98*

Note: Scores on each scale can vary between 1 and 5, with higher scores indicating greater support for CCTV. *= $p < .05$. Significance was tested for using standard t-tests

This pattern is similar to that identified in the analysis of attitudes to public drinking and drinking legislation, and seems to support the idea that women are more in favour of public order initiatives than men. However, when women expressed support for the CCTV

⁷ This was the same division of the respondents as was used in the analysis of the public drinking data in chapter 1.

cameras in the interviews, their support was not without qualifications. For example, in an interview with a thirty-year old woman, the issue of who watches the cameras was raised:

'Well, I think you tend to feel safer psychologically because you know the cameras are there. Whether there is actually anyone decent sat behind the cameras that would act if they did see anything immediately I don't know. You hear all sorts of stories don't you, you know about people that do their job properly, you know. So I don't know, I suppose it gives the feeling of safety, yeah' (30 year old woman).

Here gender plays a double role. The interviewee sees CCTV as a useful tool against the threat of violence in public places. However, the support is tempered by anxieties over the reliability of the (male) CCTV camera operators to be doing their job properly.⁸

Interestingly, the national evaluation (The Scarman Centre, forthcoming) did not find any statistically significant relationship between support for CCTV and socio-demographic characteristics of individuals, including age and gender.

Place identification and attitudes to CCTV

There was no direct relationship between levels of place identification (defined as a sense of pride in, or belonging to, Market Square) and attitudes to CCTV in general, but the greater the strength of place identification, the more respondents felt that CCTV was effective at reducing crime in Market Square and the more they felt that CCTV made them feel safer in Market Square (see Appendix D, Table A5).

CCTV and feelings about social inclusion

The relationship between attitudes to CCTV and beliefs about social inclusion was also analysed. No significant relationship between answers to the question 'a good mix of people use the Market Square area of the city centre' and any of the CCTV questions was found. However, analysis of answers to the statement 'some people should be kept out of the Market Square area of the city' revealed a significant relationship with all questions relating to CCTV. The more favourable the general attitude to CCTV; the more people felt that CCTV was effective at cutting crime. The more people agreed that CCTV increased feelings of safety and the less concerned they were with CCTV restrictions on their individual rights, the more people agreed that some people should be kept out of Market Square (see Appendix D, Table A4 for a table of correlations).

Taken together, these results suggest that support for CCTV may be associated with less favourable attitudes towards social inclusion. However, two qualifications should be borne in mind when evaluating this interpretation. First, as the results presented in Table A4 Appendix D indicate, the relationships involved, though statistically significant, are only moderate in strength. A more complex, multidimensional validated measure of attitudes to inclusion in the public domain is undoubtedly required and further work is needed in order to explore its relationship with related measures (e.g. fear of crime).

CCTV and sense of social responsibility

In addition to exploring the relationship between CCTV and social inclusion, we were also interested in the role played by CCTV in questions of social responsibility. One of the key aims of CCTV systems is to reduce both crime and the fear of crime by increasing the electronic surveillance of public space. A second way in which crime reduction and enhanced feelings safety might also be achieved is through increasing the willingness of people to help others who use public space. In recent years there has been some concern that our feelings of social responsibility are diminishing (the so called 'walk-on-by society' described by former Home Secretary Jack Straw). The aim of this part of the

⁸ Later in the same account, this interviewee expanded on her concerns about male camera operators, explaining that "...just because someone's working behind a camera, they see someone nice walking along the street, they probably, and they've got a male colleague, they're probably going to make comments because we're all only human at the end of the day. Do you know what I mean?"

analysis was to explore the association of CCTV with feelings of responsibility for others – and of the perception of others' responsibility for self.

The survey asked a number of questions about feelings of responsibility for others, about others responsibility for self, and about the role of CCTV in shaping feelings of responsibility for others (see Appendix A, question 17, a) to h)). An interesting and complex picture emerged from the analysis.

There was strong support for the idea that we have a responsibility for helping others. Seventy-six per cent of respondents agreed that they had a responsibility to help others in Market Square and 87 per cent thought they would help if something happened to someone else in Market Square. However, respondents were less certain that others would help them. Only 49 per cent of respondents felt that other people in the square would help if something happened to them. In other words, respondents seemed confident they would help others, but were much less confident that they would be helped by others if they were in need.

The survey then asked respondents whether the presence of CCTV cameras in Market Square reduced the need for them to get involved if something happened to others in Market Square. Thirty per cent of people agreed that the CCTV cameras meant there was less need for them to help and 26 per cent felt that the CCTV cameras reduced the need for them to worry about what happens to others in Market Square. In other words, more than a quarter of our sample felt that the presence of CCTV cameras reduced the level of personal responsibility for the welfare of others in public places.

We then explored the factors which might explain the apparent impact of CCTV on feelings of responsibility for others in public. Analysis revealed no direct relationship between attitude to CCTV in general and feelings of responsibility for others in Market Square. In other words, it was not the case that the more favourable their attitudes to CCTV, the less responsible people felt for others. However, there were weak relationships between attitudes to CCTV and both 'the need to get involved if something happens' and 'the need to worry about what happens' to others in public. This suggests the more positive the attitude to CCTV the less people felt they needed to actively get involved and the less they felt they needed to worry (see Appendix D, Table A6 for a table of correlations).

These findings are difficult to interpret. Firstly, the statistical relationships are significant but weak, and it would be unwise to make strong claims on the basis of them. Secondly, there are a number of possible explanations for the impact of CCTV on feelings of responsibility. On the one hand it may be that people see CCTV as increasing the general protection afforded to others (as well as themselves), thus reducing the likelihood that they will have to intervene or worry on behalf of others. On the other hand it may be that people feel that the presence of CCTV cameras absolves them of the need to get involved or worry as much about what happens to other people. These possible interpretations are presented to stimulate discussion and further research in this area

While the quantitative analysis does not allow us to distinguish between these two possibilities, there is some evidence from the interviews that responsibility for the welfare of others is being handed over to the CCTV cameras. For example, a young, male respondent reports his concern about the breakdown of community responsibility:

'...yeah I think most people now tend to keep themselves to themselves [...] I mean it's a sort of vicious circle isn't it, you know if you start expecting things like (CCTV) to do, take all your responsibilities for you, then it does get worse. Yeah it's hard to know really what to do. I mean it's going, but I think you've got to be a bit pragmatic to a certain extent, yeah, and just take measures you know if they look like in the short term they will do good and maybe take other measures in the longer term to, you know make people hopefully take care of each other, sort of thing but that's not something you can expect to just happen overnight and in the meantime you've perhaps got to have the cameras' (20 year old man).

This extract points to a potential dilemma arising from the spread of CCTV cameras. While people feel they are an important part of strategies to improve public order, reliance on CCTV cameras may have the unintended consequence of contributing to the erosion of feelings of social responsibility.

Summary

This chapter has described general attitudes towards CCTV and beliefs about its effectiveness in the town square in Lancaster. It has also explored some of the demographic and social variables associated with such attitudes. The main findings can be summarised as follows:

- Lancaster residents seemed moderately aware of the presence of cameras in their town centre.
- Compared to research carried out by Honess and Charman a decade ago, respondents in this survey were less suspicious about (and perhaps more accepting of) CCTV surveillance systems in general.
- People under 35 years old were significantly less supportive of CCTV systems than all other age groups, but support for CCTV did not increase systematically with age.
- Against a background of generalised support for CCTV, women were more supportive than men were.
- The more pride and identification with Market Square people felt, the more they thought CCTV was effective against crime and made them feel safer in the Square.
- The more positive peoples' attitudes to CCTV, the more tolerant their attitude to excluding people from certain public places
- The relationship between attitudes to CCTV and personal responsibility for the welfare of others is complex. There is some evidence that people who have positive attitudes to CCTV are less likely to worry about, or intervene personally to help others but this needs further exploration.
- The interview data suggests that, even when supportive of CCTV, people are aware of a dilemma at the heart of CCTV surveillance. They recognise that they need to be part of the surveillance in order for their property or themselves to be protected. However, surveillance may raise concerns about invasion of their rights to privacy.

4 Comparing attitudes towards public drinking measures and CCTV in city centre and residential locations

This chapter has two aims: first, it will compare attitudes towards street drinking and CCTV measures in order to gauge peoples' perceptions of their relative impacts on public order. Second, it will examine the extent to which such perceptions vary according to the type of public space in which the measures are implemented. In other words, we will contrast respondents' attitudes towards CCTV and street drinking legislation in both residential public spaces and city centre public spaces.

These contexts have been selected with an eye to potential extensions of public order measures in the future. Although presently the majority of council and police-controlled CCTV installations are located in busy city centre and 'night time' economy sites, extensions into residential areas are increasingly common. Indeed, several examples of such extensions already exist in Lancaster (e.g. parts of the Ryeland's Estate is under surveillance). Similarly, although street drinking legislation has tended to focus on the economic and social centres of cities such as Coventry, the extension of 'no alcohol zones' to residential streets is not uncommon⁹. In the next section, we will present data that addresses the degree to which ordinary members of the public might support or resist this kind of development.

Attitudes to CCTV/drinking measures by city centre and residential location

In order to make the relevant comparisons, we set up a series of analyses in which we compared peoples' responses when asked about a particular type of measure (CCTV or drinking legislation) and a particular type of public space (city centre or residential). To do this, we compared responses to questions about the three central dimensions of the current study: beliefs about impact on crime, beliefs about impact on safety; beliefs about impact on individual rights (see Table 4.1 for a breakdown of average scores by public order measure and type of public space).

Table 4.1 The perceived effect of CCTV and public drinking measures in residential and city centre public spaces

Type and location of measure	Impact on safety	Impact on crime	Impact on individual rights
CCTV measures in the city centre	3.60	4.06	3.90
CCTV measures in residential areas	3.34	3.28	3.58
Drinking measures in the city centre	3.38	3.57	3.62
Drinking measures in residential areas	2.85	2.71	3.46

Note: mean scores on each rating scale could vary between 1 and 5. In each case, higher scores indicate higher levels of support for the public order measure

Although at first sight the differences represented in Table 4.1 are not dramatic, some consistent patterns can be identified. Firstly, and keeping in mind that higher scores indicate higher levels of support, attitudes seem to be less favourable when the public order measure is located in a residential rather than a city centre public space. Secondly, CCTV measures generally appear to receive more favourable ratings in terms of their impact on safety, crime and rights than street drinking measures. Finally, qualifying these straightforward patterns, there seems to be a more complex interactive effect of type of measure and type of location on social perceptions. For example, ratings of safety and

⁹ For instance, the entire village of Middleton, which is located near Lancaster and Morecambe, has been designated a 'no alcohol zone'.

crime are most favourable for CCTV measures in city centre areas (3.60 and 4.06), whilst they are least favourable for public drinking measures in residential spaces (2.85 and 2.71).

This pattern was largely confirmed by statistical analysis of responses for perceptions of effectiveness against crime, both CCTV and public drinking measures were rated as more effective in a city centre context than a residential context. At the same time, irrespective of type of public space, CCTV was rated as a significantly more effective measure for reducing crime than street drinking initiatives (see Appendix D, Table A7.1 for ANOVA table). However, the interaction between type of measure and type of space was not significant.

Analysis of ratings of perceived impact on safety revealed a similar pattern of results. Once again, both CCTV and public drinking measures were rated as having a greater impact on public safety in city centre rather than residential areas, while CCTV was rated as having a greater effect on safety than drinking measures. Analysis also revealed that public drinking measures in residential areas were seen as having significantly lower impact on safety than public drinking measures in town centres or CCTV in both residential and city centres (see Appendix D, Table A7.2 for ANOVA table).

Finally, analysis indicated that people perceived threats to individual rights from CCTV and public drinking measures to be greater in residential places than in the city centre. Analysis also indicated that public drinking measures were perceived as a somewhat greater violation of individual rights than CCTV measures.¹⁰ Moreover, analysis revealed that a street drinking ban employed in residential areas was perceived as a greater violation of individual rights than a street drinking ban employed in the city centre or CCTV deployed in either residential or city centres (see Appendix D, Table A7.3 for ANOVA table).

To sum up: the survey data demonstrate the existence of higher levels of public support for CCTV than for street drinking measures and for interventions implemented in city centre areas rather than residential public spaces. In addition, on the dimensions of impact on safety and threat to individual rights, support for public drinking measures was significantly lower in residential areas than town centres and significantly lower than CCTV measures in both places. These results suggest that the extension of 'no alcohol' zones to encompass residential streets may not meet with a positive response overall.

Some of the interview accounts gathered in market square may shed light on this evaluative pattern, clarifying some of the reasons and motivations underlying respondents' survey responses. First, several interviewees argued *neither* technology was likely to be as effective or necessary in residential public spaces as in the city centre of Lancaster, which was perceived as a context where crime was far more likely to occur. Second, the implementation of public order measures in residential streets was sometimes cast as a potential intrusion upon privacy, an unwarranted restriction of individual liberty, or simply inappropriate. Consider, for instance, the account produced by a resident of the Ridge areas of Lancaster, who explained:

'I don't think they're [CCTV installations] ideal for residential areas really. I think that generally, you know, I think the fact that police can come on if they want and take a look around if they want. I think that should be sufficient for them really. You know people like to relax in their residential areas.... No I wouldn't really like the house to be watched that closely to be honest with you' (30 year old man) .

By the same token, some interviewees acknowledged that there may be special circumstances where such a policy could be justified, even if few of them perceived that it was necessary in their own residential streets. For example, one 30 year old mother suggested that cameras may have a useful role to play in monitoring darkened alleyways

¹⁰ Note, however, that for both measures the mean values lie above the scale mid-point, indicating that neither is perceived, on average, as violating individual rights.

in residential areas, though she insisted that care would need to be taken not to violate residents' privacy.

'...I think that really just very bright street lights and more patrols would make sense, wouldn't it? You know what I mean? Cameras in very dark alleyways and places like that obviously, maybe if you have to go through that way, would be an idea. But maybe if they were pointing sort of down and not above a certain level, so they wouldn't infringe on residents' privacy, do you know what I mean?' (30 year old woman)

Summary

This chapter has compared respondents' level of support for CCTV and public drinking measures across two spatial contexts in Lancaster, the city centre area and residential public spaces. The main findings can be summarized as follows:

- The impact of CCTV on public safety, crime reduction and individual rights was rated on average more favourably than the impact of public drinking measures.
- The impact of both types of intervention was rated on average more favourably in a city centre context than in a residential context.
- The potential extension of street drinking legislation to cover residential streets was evaluated least favourably in terms of its likely impacts on public safety and individual rights. This finding suggests plans to establish residential 'no alcohol' zones in residential areas may require particularly careful consultations with local residents.

5

Implications for Policy and Practice

Previous chapters have detailed the main findings of the research. In this chapter the report will consider the wider policy implications which might be drawn from the research findings.

Policy context of the research

The research presented in this report was carried out in a climate where CCTV and public drinking prohibition measures are proliferating. Government initiatives have played an important role in the extension of these measures. For example, CCTV programs were the subject of a second round of Home Office funding in 2001. This funding will enable the continuing spread of camera installations throughout England and Wales. Similarly, control over public drinking has recently been strengthened by measures established in the Criminal Justice and Police Act of 2001. A recent Home Office document has estimated that over 75 local authorities have already adopted this legislation, a number that seems likely to increase exponentially in the future (Home Office, 2003). More generally, street drinking measures are likely to form part of the government's National Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy, having been identified as one means of combating alcohol-related disorder in a recent consultation document (see Department of Health, 2003).

Evaluating the impact of CCTV and public drinking measures

Traditionally, the case for public order measures like CCTV and public drinking bans has been made in terms of their impact on crime reduction. However, previous research (and the current study) suggests that, if 'impact on crime' is to be the yardstick against which CCTV and drinking ban measures are evaluated, then the benefit of these measures is not yet proved. When it comes to evaluations of public drinking prohibitions, Ramsay (1990, 1991) and Marsh and Fox-Kibby (1992) have shown that having a drinking ban in place does not always lead to a decrease in alcohol-related crime.

Whatever the effectiveness of these measures in terms of crime reduction, the current study suggests that when people think about CCTV and public drinking measures they are concerned with far more than just 'impact on crime'. Thus, a major policy implication of the current study is the conclusion that both CCTV and public drinking measures need to be evaluated with reference to a much wider remit than 'impact on crime'.

Environmental and social impacts of CCTV and public drinking measures

Analysis of the data in this research shows that, while people hope for an impact on levels of crime (even though they don't always expect it), attitudes to CCTV and drinking measures are bound up with broader environmental and social concerns. It seems that CCTV and drinking legislation has the potential to impact on quality of life and on community values more widely. The current study points to three important dimensions over and above a concern with crime reduction:

- i) Impact on Place
- ii) Impact on Social Inclusion
- iii) Impact on Social Responsibility

Impact on Place

There is some evidence in the current study that people support these public order measures not because they think they will radically reduce crime, but because they think the measures will improve the general atmosphere in public places. Of course crime reduction is always hoped for, but the tangible benefits for local people seem to be that public spaces might look better and feel more orderly.

'Oh yeah, it gives a bad image of the town really, You know, people visiting are walking past people who've got cans in their hands and they cause a nuisance because they are drinking outdoors. They start causing, messing about cos they are drunk. They don't know what they are doing. If they are in a pub, at least they are indoors.'

(Teenage male)

These interviewees are not concerned with crime per se. They are more concerned with the nuisance value of unruly others – groups who might behave in a rowdy way or just look unsightly – thus spoiling the atmosphere for visitors or those who want to shop in peace. Such concerns are raised repeatedly in the interviews. It appears from this that greater emphasis should be given to the impact on quality of civic and social life in future evaluations of public order legislation.

There is a second and more specific recommendation which can be made on the basis of this research. Given the potential for the extension of public drinking bans under the new Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001, there is evidence that the public distinguish between the use of measures in public and in residential places. In this study, drinking bans in residential areas are seen as the least useful and more threatening to personal freedoms. If the public is to continue to support such public order initiatives, care must be taken not to extend drinking bans beyond public places without the consultation and without the support of local residents.

Impact on social inclusion

The current study suggests that those who support public order measures like CCTV and drinking bans are also likely to support excluding other individuals and groups from certain public places. This may be because one of the unintended functions of CCTV and drinking bans can be to remove individuals and groups whose presence or behavior make public places look more unsightly or feel less orderly or who are likely to cause disorder. At the same time as public order measures are increasing, the government has established, under the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, a unit to promote the inclusion of marginalised members of society, including rough sleepers, people with mental illnesses, the young unemployed and so on. These are groups who are most likely to be highly visible in public places; indeed, their visibility is the most important reminder of their status as marginalised groups.

Consequently, if social inclusion is to be more than inclusion through things like employment opportunities, but is also to mean inclusion in public life, then this study may point to a dilemma for policy makers. If there is a potential tension between the policy aims of increasing the social inclusion of marginalised groups (rather than driving them out of public places) and the use of CCTV and public drinking initiatives to promote public order then the latter may inadvertently nurture social attitudes that are intolerant of diverse public spaces and may sometimes be supported for precisely this reason. This hypothesis requires more work and evidence to support it.

Of course, this concern over making marginalised groups feel socially included must in itself be balanced against the rights of other social groups. The evidence of this study, for example, shows that women and the elderly tend to feel more included in public space (and more able to use it with comfort) when CCTV and public drinking legislation are employed. For them, the fact that some groups which they perceive as threatening are excluded, means that they feel more comfortable in public space.

This difficulty over how to make public space a place that can be used and enjoyed by all groups in society is captured neatly in the following interview extract:

'Erm it's just a good place here because erm it's like nice open area where you can see people coming and stuff but it's where a lot of people meet. It's gone a little bit down hill in the last 3 years, there's not as many people come now.'

[.] There was a point where they put a ban on people sitting on the steps during the day but they don't seem to care about that now. It was like getting a bit silly because in it's day it used to be really good coming to the steps [.] Yeah, that's it, there's a mixture of people. I've heard like my Mum said when she comes through and she actually gets a bit scared by all the pierced and tattooed tramps who sit about. She said that they're quite scary actually. But I don't know them very well but kind of know them. They're not a threat but I mean right I can see how the cross section of people could cause friction. But I think it's nice to see a cross section of people' (17 year old male)

Given the dilemma between the need to maintain public order and the need to promote social inclusion, it is important to have a debate about the kinds of public spaces we would like to create as a society and the kind of social policies that might best promote such spaces. Currently, the emphasis tends to be on crime reduction to the possible detriment of other values. Given the limited success of crime reduction as a yardstick against which to judge public order measures, it may be time for policy makers to think about the facilitation of social inclusion as an important indicator in its own right.

Impact on Social Responsibility

Finally, there is some evidence in the current study that support for CCTV surveillance is negatively associated with a sense of personal responsibility for others' welfare in public. It is important not to over-interpret this finding, which does not constitute evidence that CCTV *causes* a reduction in social concern. It may be that as public spaces are increasingly watched by cameras, so we feel less personal responsibility for what happens in those public spaces. In other words, policy makers need to consider the possibility that, as surveillance technology becomes ever more widespread, it might weaken people's sense of civic responsibility towards one another. Further research is recommended in this area.

**SURVEY OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE INSTALLATION OF CCTV
AND THE BAN ON PUBLIC DRINKING IN LANCASTER**

Survey conducted on behalf of Lancaster University, 2002.

Introduction

Hello, I'm phoning on behalf of Teleconomy, an independent telephone survey company. We have been asked by researchers at Lancaster University to carry out a survey on how the people of Lancaster and the surrounding districts feel about the development of Lancaster City Centre and about the use of CCTV technology in this area. The interview will take about 15 minutes. Do you have the time to take part in the survey now?

Thanks for agreeing to take part in the Survey. Your responses will be kept entirely confidential.

SECTION 1: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF MARKET SQUARE

There are currently proposals to redevelop Lancaster's Market Square area. Do you know the area of the city centre in which these changes would take place? It is the area around the fountain, surrounded by the museum, and shops like Woolworth's, HMV.

1. How often in the past year did you visit the area?

TICK

RELEVANT BOX

Every day	
Once a week	
Once a month	
Once in the last six months	
Once in the last twelve months	
Not at all	

Before I ask you some more detailed questions, can I ask you to close your eyes for a moment and imagine the Market Square? Imagine the circular fountain, the museum steps and the shops that surround the square. Do you have a picture of the area in your head?

2. Now, I'm going to read you some statements about Market Square. Then, for each statement, I will ask whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement.

[Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

CIRCLE RELEVANT

NUMBER

A good mix of people use the Market Square 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
Some groups of people should be kept out of the Market Square 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
The atmosphere in Market Square is a positive part of the life of Lancaster 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
The current state of Market Square lets Lancaster down 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
I feel at home in Market Square - 4-- 5	1 -- 2-- 3 -
I am proud of Market Square 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
Visiting Market Square gives me a sense of local identity 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --

SECTION 2: PERCEPTIONS OF CCTV CAMERAS IN MARKET SQUARE

Thank you for answering those questions. In the next section, I want to ask you some general questions about Market Square.

3. Firstly, you may know that in some public places there are now CCTV cameras to watch what is going on. Have you noticed any CCTV cameras in Market Square?
YES/NO/DON'T KNOW

If YES, where are they?

What can the CCTV cameras see?

If NO or DON'T KNOW – inform them that there are a number of cameras (one directly above the cobblers shop which can see the whole square and two on poles – one near Barclays Bank – the other near Next – which can see parts of the square)

4. Now, I am going to read you some statements about CCTV cameras in Lancaster City Centre. Then, for each statement, I will ask you whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement.

[Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

a) The CCTV cameras in Lancaster city centre are an effective way of cutting crime

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

b) The CCTV cameras in Lancaster city centre makes me feel safe

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

c) The CCTV cameras in Lancaster city centre restrict my individual rights

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

5. Do you think the CCTV cameras might ever be watching you?

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE: YES – NO – DON'T KNOW

If YES or DON'T KNOW, why?

If NO - why not?

6. Which individuals or groups are most likely to be watched by the cameras? Please give examples and say why?

7. Who do you think is controlling the cameras?

TICK RELEVANT

BOX

Police	
Private Security	
City Council	
Other	

SECTION 3: ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE BAN ON PUBLIC DRINKING IN LANCASTER

In addition to the cameras, some public places are now covered by bans on drinking alcohol in public streets.

8. Do you know whether or not a ban exists on drinking alcohol in public in Market Square?

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE: YES – NO – DON'T KNOW

If NO, inform them that there is a ban in place.

9. Why do you think such a ban was introduced?

10. Now, I am going to read to you some statements about the ban on public drinking in Lancaster city centre. Then, for each statement, I will ask you whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement.

[Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2. = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

a) The ban on drinking in public streets in Lancaster city centre is an effective way of cutting crime

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE

1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

b) The ban on drinking in public streets in Lancaster city centre makes me feel safe

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE

1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

c) The ban on drinking in public streets in Lancaster city centre restricts my individual rights

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE

1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

11. Could such a ban ever affect you?

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE: YES – NO – DON'T KNOW

If YES or DON'T KNOW, why?

If NO - why not?

12. Which individuals / groups are most likely to be affected by such a ban?
Please give examples and say why

SECTION 4: PERCEPTIONS OF CCTV CAMERAS AND A BAN ON PUBLIC DRINKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Now I want to move away from the Town Centre for moment, and to ask you some questions about where you live. Before I do, can I ask you to close your eyes once again and imagine the street where you live. Do you have a picture of your street in your head?

13. Can a CCTV camera already see down your street and see where you live?

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE: YES – NO – DON'T KNOW

14. Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. For each statement, I will ask you whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement. [Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2. = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

a) CCTV cameras in my street would be an effective way of cutting crime
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

b) CCTV cameras in my street would make me feel safe
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

c) CCTV cameras in my street would restrict my individual rights
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

15. Does a ban on drinking alcohol in public already cover where you live?

CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE: YES – NO – DON'T KNOW

16. Now, indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. For each statement, I will ask you whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement. [Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2. = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

a) A ban on drinking in public in my street would be an effective way of cutting crime
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1 – 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

b) A ban on drinking in public in my street would make me feel safe
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1 – 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

c) A ban on drinking in public in my street would restrict my individual rights
CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE 1 – 2-- 3 -- 4—5

SECTION 5: GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF CCTV CAMERAS AND A BAN ON PUBLIC DRINKING

To conclude the survey, I want to ask you about your views in general on CCTV and public drinking legislation.

17. As in previous sections, I would like to read you some statements. Then, for each statement, I will ask you whether you strongly agree with the statement, agree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement or strongly disagree with the statement.

[Note: 1 = strongly agree; 2 = means agree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = means disagree; 5 = strongly disagree]

i) BYSTANDER SCALE QUESTIONS

	CIRCLE RELEVANT NUMBER
a) If anything happened to me in Market Square, the people who watch the CCTV cameras would make sure I was helped	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
b) If anything happened to me in Market Square, other people in the Square would make sure I was helped	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
c) If anything happened to someone else in Market Square, I would make sure they were helped	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
d) Having CCTV cameras in Market Square means there is less need for me to get involved if something happens to someone else	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
e) Having CCTV cameras in Market Square means I don't need to worry as much about what happens to other people in the Market Square	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
f) I feel a sense of responsibility for helping other people in Market Square	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
g) Other people in Market Square feel a sense of responsibility for helping me	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
h) The people who watch the CCTV cameras in Market Square feel a sense of responsibility for helping me	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5

ii) CCTV SCALE QUESTIONS

	CIRCLE RELEVANT NUMBER
a) People who obey the law have nothing to fear from CCTV cameras	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
b) CCTV cameras could easily be used and abused by the wrong people	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
c) It would be OK to use hidden CCTV cameras	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
d) CCTV cameras are really 'spy cameras' and should be banned	1-- 2-- 3-- 4-- 5
e) People have the right to know whenever they are being watched by a CCTV camera	1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5
f) Only criminals have any reason to be afraid of CCTV cameras	1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5
g) The more of these CCTV cameras we have the better	1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5
h) People should always be told by a large notice when such a camera is being used	1-- 2-- 3 -- 4-- 5

i) CCTV cameras invade people's privacy 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3 --
j) The people who control CCTV cameras can certainly be 5 trusted to use them only for the public good	1-- 2-- 3 -- 4--
k) In the future, CCTV cameras will be used by the government 4-- 5 to control people	1-- 2-- 3 --

iii) ALCOHOL SCALE QUESTIONS

CIRCLE RELEVANT
NUMBER

a) All drinking of alcohol in public should be banned 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3--
b) As long as they are not causing trouble, people should be allowed to drink 4-- 5 where they like	1-- 2-- 3--
c) Drinking alcohol in public streets is harmless fun 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3--
d) People who drink alcohol on the street are a menace to society 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3--
e) It's antisocial to drink alcohol in public streets 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3--
f) A ban on drinking in public streets restricts people's freedom 4-- 5	1-- 2-- 3--
g) When I see a group of people drinking alcohol in public streets I feel 4-- 5 anxious	1-- 2-- 3--

SECTION 6: RESPONDENT INFORMATION

Finally, for our confidential records, can I ask you a few questions about yourself?

18. Which area of Lancaster do you live in?

19. Are you (CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE)?

- Male

-Female

20. What is your age?

How would you describe your identity? (CIRCLE RELEVANT RESPONSE)

White or White British

Black or Black British

Asian or Asian British

Other. Please Specify: _____

21. How would you describe your current living arrangements?

TICK RELEVANT
BOX

a) Married	
b) Cohabiting	
c) Single	
d) Separated	
e) Divorced	

f) Widowed	
g) Other. Please specify.	

22. Have you been a victim of one of the following crimes in the last 12 months? [Note: the respondent may have been a victim in more than one category]

TICK RELEVANT **BOX(ES)**

a) Violent attack	
b) Theft	
c) Vandalism	
d) Burglary	
e) Drink related attack	
f) Other. Please Specify:	

23. How often have you had an alcoholic drink of any kind during the last 12 months?

TICK RELEVANT
BOX

a) Almost every day	
b) 5 or 6 days a week	
c) 3 or 4 days a week	
d) Once or twice a week	
e) Once or twice a month	
f) Once every couple of months	
g) Once or twice a year	
h) Not at all	

Telephone survey

Some of these variables used in the survey were measured using single item, ad hoc measures; however, whenever possible, we used composite scales that have featured in previous research. For example, our measure of general attitudes towards CCTV employed a set of items validated by Honess and Charman (1992), and our composite measure of place identification drew on standard items used in other research (e.g. see Bonaiuto, Breakwell & Cano, 1996; Cuba and Hummon, 1996). In addition, we developed a seven-item scale to measure individuals' level of concern over public drinking. Pilot research carried out with a student sample (n=60) suggested that this measure possessed good test-retest reliability and internal consistency. Moreover, respondents' performance on this scale was significantly associated with their attitudes towards street drinking regulations in Lancaster, providing some evidence of its predictive validity.

The questionnaire was administered between March and May 2002 by representatives of TELECONOMY, a telephone survey company that has conducted a range of research on behalf of Lancaster University. Adult respondents were randomly selected from a list of local telephone numbers, originally constructed to provide a representative sample of individuals living across different areas of Lancaster. Although all respondents had previously expressed their willingness to participate in telephone surveys, in practice we had a response rate of 62 per cent, with 744 out of 1186 people contacted agreeing to complete the questionnaire. Initial inspection of the sample indicated that it was a good approximation of Lancaster's adult population with one exception: a disproportionately small number of respondents (under 10%) fell in the 18-30 age bracket. In order to improve the survey's representativeness in this respect, we distributed a further 100 print versions of the questionnaire at various local sites (including the campus of Lancaster University). This yielded a further 73 respondents, 58 of whom were in the 18-30 age bracket.

Questionnaire responses were captured as an SPSS data file and prepared for statistical analysis. Closer inspection of the data set revealed that a few respondents had left large numbers of missing responses, and it was decided to remove their data. The final demographic breakdown of the final sample was as follows. A total of 808 questionnaire responses were deemed suitable for the purposes of analysis. 353 (44%) were completed by men and 453 (56%) were completed by women, and respondents' ages ranged from 18 to 84 years, with a mean of 46.8 years. Over 95 per cent of respondents surveyed classified themselves as 'white', reflecting the fairly homogeneous ethnic composition of the local population.

Section 1

1. How often do you come to Market Square?
2. Why do you come to Market square?
3. Do you generally come to Market Square by yourself or with others?
4. What do you like or dislike about Market Square? Elaborate.
5. Do you think that Market Square important to local life? Elaborate.
6. What groups of people use the square? What is your opinion about those groups?

Section 2

7. As you can see, CCTV cameras operate in Market Square.
8. Why are they here?
9. Who do you think they are they watching?
10. Do you think that they ever watch you?
11. What is your opinion about CCTV cameras?
12. CCTV cameras are typically used in public areas of town and city centres. However, in future cameras may be mounted in some residential areas. What is your opinion of this policy? How would you feel if a camera was positioned in your street?

Section 3

As you can see, there is a ban on public drinking in Market Square

13. Why do you think that the authorities have introduced this ban?
14. Who is the ban directed towards?
15. Do you think that the drinking ban might ever affect you?
16. What is your opinion about the public drinking ban?
17. Street drinking legislation typically applies to behaviour in public areas of town and city centres. However, in future such bans may be applied in some residential areas. What is your opinion of this policy? How would you feel if a public drinking ban applied to your street?

Section 4

18. If there was a violent incident in Market Square, such as a fight or an assault, how useful would the CCTV camera's in generating help for the victim?
19. How likely is it that would you intervene to help the victim? Explain.
20. How likely is it that other people would intervene to help the victim? Explain.
21. If you were a victim of an assault, how likely is it that other people in Market Square would offer assistance? Why?

Section 5

Age:
Gender:
Area of residence:
Ethnicity:

Appendix 4

Additional tables

Table A1 Table of correlations: Attitude to public drinking/ CCTV and beliefs about impact on crime,safety and individual rights

	Impact on crime	Impact on safety	Impact on rights
Attitude to public drinking	0.46	0.47	0.46
Attitude to CCTV	0.34	0.38	0.43

All correlations = $p < 0.05$

Table A2 Table of correlations: Age as a predictor of attitudes to public drinking and CCTV

	Impact on crime	Impact on safety	Impact on rights
Age (public drinking)	0.21	0.25	0.26
Age (CCTV)	0.12	0.58	0.22

All correlations = $p < 0.05$

Table A3 Table of correlations: Attitudes towards public drinking/the public drinking byelaw and tolerance of social inclusion

	A good mix of people use Market Square	Some people should be kept out of Market Square
Concern over public drinking	- 0.07*	-0.32*
Impact on crime	-0.04	-0.19*
Impact on safety	-0.003	-0.22*
Impact on individual rights	-0.05	-0.13*

* $p < 0.05$

Table A4 Table of correlations: Attitudes to CCTV and tolerance of social inclusion

	A good mix of people use Market Square	Some people should be kept out of Market Square
Attitude to CCTV	- 0.03	-0.28*
Impact on crime	0.06	-0.19*
Impact on safety	0.07	-0.19*
Impact on individual rights	0.006	-0.12*

*p<0.05

Table A 5 Table of correlations: Place identification and attitudes towards street drinking and CCTV measures

Attitude	Level of Place Identification
Impact of drinking law on crime	0.07
Impact of drinking by law on safety	0.09*
Impact of drinking byelaw on individual rights	0.01
Impact of CCTV on crime	0.1*
Impact of CCTV on safety	0.2*
Impact of CCTV on individual rights	-0.002

*p<0.05

Table A 6 Table of correlations: CCTV and social responsibility

	CCTV means less need to get involved	CCTV means less need to worry
Attitude to CCTV	0.17	0.18
Sense of responsibility for others	0.09	0.12

All correlations = $p < 0.05$

Table A7 ANOVA Tables: Type of place (city centre/residential) by type of measure (drinking legislation/CCTV).

7.1) Analysis of Variance for impact on crime

Source	df	F	p	Eta squared
Place (P)	1	530.39	.001	.40
Measure (M)	1	266.07	.001	.25
PxM	1	1.44	.23	.002

7.2) Analysis of Variance for impact on safety

Source	df	F	p	Eta squared
Place (P)	1	129.64	.001	.14
Measure (M)	1	131.03	.001	.14
PxM	1	27.97	.001	.034

7.3) Analysis of Variance for impact on rights

Source	df	F	p	Eta squared
Place (P)	1	40.62	.001	.05
Measure (M)	1	58.62	.001	.07
PxM	1	9.31	.001	.01

References

Day, K. (1999). Embassies and sanctuaries: women's experiences of race and fear in public space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17, 307-328.

Department of Health (2003). National Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy: Main themes of the joint consultation carried out by the Department of Health and the Strategy Unit. London.

Ditton, J, Short, E., Phillips, S., Norris, C. & Armstrong, G. (1999) *The Effect of Closed Circuit Television Cameras on Recorded Crime Rates and Public Concern about Crime in Glasgow*. The Scottish Office Central Research Unit.

The Scarman Centre, (Home Office, forthcoming)

Honess, T. & Charman, E. (1992) *Closed Circuit Television in Public Places*. Police Research Group Crime Prevention Series Paper 35, HMSO).

Home Office (2001). Byelaws on the consumption of intoxicating liquor in designated places. Local Legislation Section. London: The Home Office.

Home Office (2003). 'Alcohol Free Zones': Designation orders for public drinking. Home Office: London.

Institute of Alcohol Studies (2001). Councils use public drinking law. <http://www.ias.org.uk>

Marsh, P. & Fox-Kibby, K.F. (1992). Drinking and public disorder. A report of research conducted for the Portman Group by MCM research.

Mirrlees-Black, C., Budd, T., Partridge, S. and Mayhew, P. (1998). *The 1998 British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office.

Norris, C. & Armstrong, G (1999) *The maximum surveillance society: the rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg.

Painter, K. and Tilley, N.(eds) (1999) Surveillance of public space: CCTV, street lighting and crime prevention. *Crime Prevention Series vol 10*. Criminal Justice Press

Police and Criminal Justice Act (2001). <http://www.hmsso.gov.uk/acts/>

Ramsay, M. (1989). Downtown drinkers: the perceptions and fears of the public in a city centre. *Crime Prevention Unit: Paper 19*. London: Home Office.

Ramsay, M. (1990) Lagerland lost? An experiment in keeping drinkers off the streets in central Coventry and elsewhere. *Crime Prevention Unit Paper 22*. London: Home Office.

Ramsay, M. (1991) Restricting public drinking: studies by the Home Office and two local authorities. *Home Office Research Bulletin*, 30, 16-20.

Short, E & Ditton, J (1996) *Does Closed Circuit Television Prevent Crime? An evaluation of the use of CCTV Surveillance in Airdrie Town Centre*. Scottish Office Central Research Unit

Short, E & Ditton, J (1998) Seen and now heard: talking to the targets of open street CCTV. *British Journal of Criminology*, 38, 3, 404-428

Tilley, N. (1983) Understanding car parks, crime and CCTV. *Crime Prevention Unit Paper 42*. London: Home Office.

Walzer, M. (1986). The pleasures and costs of urbanity. *Dissent*, Fall Issue, 470-475.