

Technical note

Project	Southampton In Car Camera System
Subject	Trade Surveys
Author	Liz Richardson

Date Ref 10th August 2012

1 Introduction

A trade survey was issued to all drivers in Southampton with the aim of obtaining views on the requirement for vehicles to be fitted with an in car camera system. Some 435 responses were received, giving a response rate of 31%. It should be noted that not all totals sum to the total number of respondents as some respondents failed to answer all of the questions.

2 General

Table 2.1 shows the breakdown of responses according to individuals' involvement with the trade.

	Frequency	Percent
HC Driver	172	39.5
HC Plate Owner	146	33.6
HC Operator	25	5.75
PH Operator	72	16.6
PH Driver	169	38.9
PH Plate Owner	142	32.6

Table 2.1 – Breakdown of Responses between Trades (multiple responses)

Table 2.2 indicates the proportion of the trade who were aware of the In Car Camera Policy. The majority of the trade (98.4%) were aware of the policy with only 1.6% unaware.

Table 2.2 – Are yo	aware of the policy
--------------------	---------------------

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	419	98.4
No	7	1.6
Total	426	100



Respondents were then asked whether they agreed with the policy. The results are shown in Table 2.3. Views were mixed with 61.2% against the policy.

Table 2.3 – Do you	i agree with	the policy?
--------------------	--------------	-------------

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	162	38.8
No	256	61.2
Total	418	100.0

Those who were in favour of the policy made the following comments:

- 'protects driver and passenger'
- 'safer for driver and passenger'
- 'helpful for Police investigations'
- 'feel safer as a HC driver as I don't know who im picking up'
- 'prevents crime'
- 'stops disputes'
- Acts as a deterrent

Those who were against the policy made the following comments:

- 'Should be drivers choice'
- 'Council shouldn't tell me what to do'
- 'Used as a family car and there should be privacy'
- 'invasion of privacy'
- 'freedom of choice'
- 'shouldn't be compulsory'
- 'against human rights'
- 'no other town has this policy'
- 'Camera too expensive'

Technical note 10 August 2012 Project: Southampton Taxi Study Subject: Trade Surveys

- 'Should be able to turn camera off'
- 'My car has stop start technology and the camera flattens the battery'
- 'Cost of moving the camera to a new vehicle'
- 'its breaking the law'
- 'my clients are regular pre booked, they don't want cameras'
- 'should be optional'
- 'I have clients who wont use me if CCTV is put in'
- 'all hackneys should have a partition and don't need a camera'
- 'customers are still running away and not paying'
- 'not happy with sound'
- 'I lost three days work when camera was being fitted'

Respondents who didn't agree with the policy were asked if they would agree if only digital images were captured. As reported in Table 2.4 87.3% of those disagreeing with the policy still disagreed should only digital images be captured.

Table 2.4 – Do you agree with the policy?

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	30	12.7
No	206	87.3
Total	236	100.0

3 Drivers

Respondents were asked whether they have a camera installed in the vehicle that they drive. The results are shown in Table 3.1. Over three quarters (76.7% had a camera installed in the vehicle that they drove.

Table 3.1 – Do you have a camera installed in the vehicle that you drive?

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	297	76.7
No	90	23.3
Total	387	100.0

Those with a camera were asked when this was installed. Table 3.2 reports that 85.2% of drivers had their camera installed between 2010 and 2012.

Table 3.2 – When was it installed?

	Frequency	Percentage
2002	1	0.48
2003	2	0.95
2004	0	0.00
2005	1	0.48
2006	4	1.9
2007	1	0.48
2008	11	5.2
2009	11	5.2
2010	66	31.4
2011	77	36.7
2012	36	17.1
Total	210	100.0

Drivers were subsequently asked what effect the camera had had. As detailed in Table 3.3 drivers had experienced a range of effects. Some 43.8% felt safer following the camera being fitted. However 45.5% felt that the camera was an invasion of their privacy.

Table 3.3 – What effect had the camera had (multiple responses)?

	Frequency	Percentage
I feel safer	130	43.8
I feel less vulnerable	94	31.6
I drive more at night	57	19.2
I drive in areas of Southampton that I wouldn't before	44	14.8
I feel that it is an invasion of my privacy	135	45.5
Passengers behaviour changes	115	38.7
No effect	87	29.3
Other	6	2.0

Those drivers with a camera were then asked if they had ever been attacked by a passenger within the last year. Only 9.1% admitted to having been physically attacked, with 27.9% stating that they had been verbally attacked. Nearly two thirds (65.3%) had not been attacked. However when asked whether this had been prior to or following the introduction of the camera over half (59.1%) stated that this was after the camera was introduced. Of those that had been attacked only 26% reported the incident to the Police and/or SCC.

Table 3.4 – Have you been attacked by a passenger within the last year (multiple responses)?

	Frequency	Percentage
Physically attacked	27	9.1
Verbally attacked	83	27.9
Not attacked	194	65.3

Table 3.5 – Was this before or after the camera was installed?

	Frequency	Percentage
Before	36	40.9
After	52	59.1
Total	88	100.0

Drivers were then asked whether they felt that the camera has had a positive impact on safety. Some 39.5% of people felt that the camera had had an impact on both driver and public safety, however 46% felt that there had been no positive impact.

Table 3.6 – Do	vou think the o	camera has h	nad a positive	impact on safety?
10010 0.0 00	<i>you unin uno c</i>	Jannora mao m	iaa a poontio	impaor on oarory.

	Frequency	Percentage
Driver Safety only	20	7.6
Public Safety only	18	6.8
Both	104	39.5
None	121	46.0
Total	263	100.0

Drivers without a camera fitted to their vehicle were then asked what they would perceive the effect to be of having a camera fitted to the vehicle that they drove. As detailed in Table 3.7 a third felt that they would feel safer (33.7%), whereas 24.6% didn't feel that there would be any effect.

Table 3.7 – Perceived effect of having a camera fitted?

	Frequency	Percentage
I will feel safer	100	33.7
I will feel less vulnerable	68	22.9
I will drive more at night	44	14.8
I will drive in areas of Southampton that I wouldn't before	30	10.1
I will feel that it is an invasion of my privacy	93	31.3
I believe passengers will behave differently	76	25.6
No effect	73	24.6
Other	5	1.7

4 Vehicle Owners

Vehicle Owners were asked if they had a camera installed in the vehicle that they own. Some 84.6% of owners stated that they had a camera installed. Table 4.1 demonstrates when this was installed. Some 87.1% of owners installed their camera since 2010

Table 4.1 – When was your camera installed?

	Frequency	Percentage
2004	1	1.9
2005	0	0
2006	0	0
2007	2	3.8
2008	1	1.9
2009	3	5.6
2010	15	27.8
2011	21	38.9
2012	11	20.4
Total	54	100.0

Owners were then asked whether they were aware that the cost of the camera is fully deductable in the first year. The majority of owners (84%) were aware of this.

Table 4.2 – Were you aware that the camera is tax deductable in Year 1?

	Frequency	Percentage
Aware	184	84.0
Not Aware	35	16.0
Total	219	100.0

Owners were then asked whether they had claimed the cost of the camera back. As detailed in Table 4.3 two thirds of owners (66.7%) had claimed the cost back. A third however had not. Reasons given included:

- 'didn't know'
- 'most of us don't earn enough to pay tax'
- Waiting for refund
- It came with car
- Waste of tax payers money

Table 4.3 – Have you claimed the cost of your camera back?

	Frequency	Percentage
Claimed	126	66.7
Not Claimed	63	33.3
Total	189	100