

Thematic Report 2

Population survey results: The general public's use of, views about, and attitudes towards journey cams

1. Introduction and methods

Journey cams in their different forms – including video-enabled devices not purposefully engineered to record journeys but used for roads policing, like smart phones and doorbell cameras – are a relatively recent and increasingly affordable technology. Initial reflection on the qualitative component of this projects' data collection – interviews with strategic and operational police personnel, submitters of journey cam footage and general road users, and other government and industry stakeholders – made it evident that perceptions and assumptions about journey cams are diverse and often contradictory. Insights into broader behaviours and attitudes at the level of general population from secondary sources were scarce and not entirely reliable, with available data limited to isolated estimates on indicators like use of dashcams present in media or industry publications. The project team decided to repurpose some of the project funding, with permission of the RST, to design and commission a population survey on public use of, and attitudes to, journey cams, with a view to informing the project Recommendations and, beyond, the use of this technology in roads policing, and for road safety.

We commissioned YouGov to carry out a survey comprising of 16 questions, which would be deployed according to their usual methodology and completed by a representative sample of around 2000 UK adults. All the figures discussed below, unless otherwise stated, are from YouGov Plc. The eventual total sample size was 2072 adults and fieldwork was undertaken between 17th and 18th April 2023. The survey was carried out online. The figures have been weighted and are representative of all UK adults (aged 18+). The questions which made up the survey can be found at Appendix 1.

2. Journey cam usage and potential growth by road use modality

Respondents were asked to indicate the ways in which they travel. They could select more than one answer option, and for each of those selected they were subsequently asked about any use of journey cams (see Table 1). Responses to these questions on road use and journey cam usage show that most journey cams are fitted to vehicles with four (or more) wheels. Approximately 65% (N=1347) of the 2072 survey respondents drive a car regularly and an extra 5% (N=104) drive a larger vehicle. 15% of them 'always' use a dash cam and an additional 8% use one 'sometimes'. Cyclists comprised 10% of the sample and 6% of them claimed to

'always' use a camera while they ride, while an extra 12% 'sometimes' use one. The highest usage per road use mode is among motorcyclists: these were 3% of our sample, of whom 27% 'always' use a camera when they ride. Equestrians made up a small percentage of our sample (1%) but 23% of them 'always' use a camera when riding. 10% of wheelchair and other mobility aid users (approximately 3% of the sample) said they always use some form of camera to record their journeys. Pedestrians – a predictably very large group comprising 63% of the sample – are the least likely to use a camera to record roads: only 2% do it always.

Table 1. Journey Cam adoption by road use modality

Road Use (regularly)	% of sample	Always/Sometimes uses JC
Drives a car	65.5	22.9
Drives a larger vehicle	4.9	
Drives a motorcycle / scooter	3.7	50
Rides a bicycle	10.4	18.1
Rides a horse	1.2	47
Uses a wheelchair / mobility aid	2.8	34.5
Walks on local streets	62.8	7.6
Sample = 2072. Online survey undertaken between 17th - 18th April 2023. The figures have been weighted and are representative of all UK adults (aged 18+).		

Higher use does not necessarily entail higher levels of footage submission to the police, as we will see below in section 4. The stand-out figure appears to be the relatively low uptake by cyclists, which contrasts with relatively high figures of submissions in force data. This resonates with findings in the qualitative interviews - cyclists are more active in their concerns with road safety, motivated by their suffering disproportionately from road incidents and episodes of everyday endangerment.

A cautionary note is necessary in relation to multimodality, which means that raising conclusions from these figures is not easy. We know from our interviews, for example, that individuals who use a camera during their bicycle or horse rides tend to have them fitted to their motor vehicles as well.

2.1 Potential for future adoption by mode

Road users who do not currently own or use a journey cam but would consider using one in the future make up a substantial section of our sample across all road-use modalities. Most striking, perhaps, is the finding that 45% (N=627) of car drivers, our largest group, currently do not use a camera but would consider it – indicating an enormous potential for growth in journey cam take-up. Equivalent numbers for motorcyclists were 27% (N=21) and for cyclists 35% (N=74), also indicating growth potential albeit from smaller groups. 36% (N=9) of horse riders and 30% (N=18) of wheelchair users do not use a camera but are likely to consider it, as would 17% (N=222) of pedestrians – a very large group. A warning is necessary here that

relates to much of what follows – once road use modality is combined with other variables (notably experience of journey cam submission), the numbers of respondents become too small to consider our findings conclusive or statistically significant. This is expected when gauging perceptions and experiences of a relatively new phenomenon at a population level, and only means caution in interpreting our findings, especially when we do not refer to whole samples but, for example, when we compare submitters with non-submitters, generally or within a certain mode of road use.

3. Motivations, usefulness and concerns: Users and non-users on journey cams

3.1 General public attitudes towards journey cams

The survey presented respondents with nine brief, and purposefully simplified, statements on what journey cams represent for them, four of them with positive connotations and five with negative connotations. All four ‘positive’ statements were the most chosen. Cameras are:

- *‘Sensible products for careful and considerate people who want to make the roads safer’* (46% of respondents)
- *‘A great way to help catch the bad guys’* (35.2%)
- *‘A way for road users to show others how dangerous roads can be’* (33.1%), and
- *‘A great way of extending Neighbourhood Watch onto the roads’* (26.3%).

However, for some, cameras are:

- *‘Just a way to encourage vigilantes’* (14.6%, and the most commonly chosen).
- *‘Bad because they invade our right to privacy’* (12.8% of respondents).
- *‘Just toys for people who like technology’* (13.4%)
- *‘An unnecessary gimmick for entertainment’* (8.2%).
- *‘For do-gooders who should mind their own business’* (9.4%).

This gives us a rough sense of the public perception of journey cams and their users. This appears to be generally positive, and the merits of journey cam use (contribution to road safety in the form of increased accountability, as well as a way to show everyday experiences of endangerment) outweigh concerns with issues like privacy or vigilantism, as well as any apprehension towards adopters of what is still a relatively new technology. This appears to show a broad platform of positive belief and values attached to the use of journey cams to aid roads policing, with only around 10% of adults categorically professing feelings of hostility towards them.

Issues of privacy and concerns with increasing surveillance, the most common legal and criminological objection to the use of journey cams, were explored further in the survey via

more specific questions. Responses tended to show higher proportions of concerned respondents than in the question on general attitudes towards journey cams. Asked about their own potential use of journey cams, almost a third (34.8%) of respondents either strongly agreed or tended to agree that this would *'make [them] feel like [they are] spying on other road users'* (marginally outweighing those who disagree with this statement to any extent, 33.9%). Almost a quarter of respondents either strongly agreed or tended to agree with the description of journey cams as *'an invasion of other people's privacy'* (43.1% disagreed or tended to disagree). Interestingly, answers in these two questions leaned in not very dissimilar directions for both camera users and non-users. Concerns with privacy and surveillance appear to overlap to some extent with journey cam use, showing the multilayered nature of this issue, in particular when ordinary citizens are involved as active agents with complex motivations (Brayne et al, 2023).

3.2 Journey cam users: Motivation

In our Thematic Report covering the marketing of, and communications around, journey cams we discuss in detail how manufacturers market journey cams, in particular dash cams, and note that these devices are largely pitched as personal security/insurance products for drivers rather than as devices to record road safety related incidents - and even less so as ways to produce evidence of *'policeable moments'*. Most journey cam owners amongst our respondents do appear to reflect these marketing discourses: they do not report incidents to the police, and tend to use journey cams for reasons that could collectively be described as *'personal reassurance'*. Seventeen percent of respondents who always or sometimes use a journey cam – still a sizeable proportion – have sent footage to police sites, and an additional 10% have uploaded footage to social media sites. A small proportion (3.5%) have done both and 68% have done neither. It would of course be possible for this 68%, or part of it, to have not witnessed incidents they considered reportable. However, asked directly about the purpose of the footage they have collected, almost 56% of cam owners respond that they collect it *for their own use in case they are in a collision*, rather than for more altruistic reasons.

More encouraging were the respondents' views when asked to consider possible expanded use of journey cams by the public in general. Current journey cam users (especially submitters) were more prone than non-users to agree that, were this to happen, there would be a range of desirable outcomes. This was the case for individually desirable outcomes (like reducing insurance premiums or helping make it clear who is at fault in a collision) but also for broader socially desirable ones (like helping stop road users from "getting away with doing dangerous things"). This would appear to indicate positive experiences of journey cam use engendering more complex motivations that go beyond the more individualistic ones – a point that also emerges from our qualitative interviews with submitters.

Also interesting were the responses of non-users of journey cams when presented with potential positive outcomes of their own hypothetical use of such technologies. The most favoured option was that such use would "protect me from people who deliberately stage

accidents”, with 73.5% of non-users either strongly agreeing or tending to agree, and only 8.2% strongly or tending to disagree. Whilst this indicates a preference for the more self-interested outcomes, this tendency is not as accentuated as it is for current journey cam users, 81.9% of whom strongly or somewhat agreed with this statement.

Responses on the effects of journey cam use with negative connotations (it would "make me feel I was spying on other road users") did show a substantially different balance between users and non-users: net agree answers are 37.2% for non-users and net disagree answers 32.8% (30.4% and 43.3% for journey cam users). Non-users are, perhaps unsurprisingly, less convinced that adopting journey cams would improve their own behaviour on the roads (22.3% agree, versus 38.9% of users) or that it would make them less anxious (20.6% agree, versus 41.5% of users). Overall, while the gaps are not as substantial as could have been expected, there is a considerable variation in the views on the virtues and shortcomings of journey cams as a tool to police the roads between individuals who have already adopted them and those who have not. However, this distinction is, interestingly, most striking *between* different types of journey cam user (the submitter versus the non-submitter).

3.3 Collisions and near misses and their possible effect on reporting growth

Asked about experiences of serious incidents on the roads in the year prior to responding, collisions were reported by:

- 7% of drivers
- 23% of motorcyclists
- 13% of cyclists
- 23% of horse-riders
- 20% of wheelchair/mobility aid users, and
- 5% of pedestrians

Concerning near misses were reported by:

- 17% of drivers
- 27% of motorcyclists
- 27% of cyclists
- 32% of horse-riders
- 21% of wheelchair/mobility users and
- 17% of pedestrians

While a sizeable part of these incidents will probably have been relatively minor and non-injury collisions, the figures are startling. Journey cam use and experience of these incidents appears to be related: while 6.5% of respondents had been in a collision and 17.1% had a near miss that concerned them, these figures grow to 13.1% and 24.7% for users of any form of

journey cam. Considering only road users who have submitted footage to the police, the increase is even more striking: 39.4% had been involved in a collision and 24.1% in a near-miss that concerned them. While we cannot discern the nature of this relationship with the available data, the high numbers do nevertheless provide a backdrop for journey cams demand and potential growth. This is further supported by findings of the qualitative interviews of the project, where many submitters' stories of journey cam use started as a result of a particularly traumatic experience.

The predictable correlation between feelings and experiences of dangerousness or endangerment on the roads, and use of cameras, is further supported by responses to questions related to a hypothetical situation in which there were more journey cams in use. Among the whole sample, 39% of respondents agree that they would *'feel safer on the road if there were more people using cameras to film other people's behaviour'* (with approximately a third of respondents neither agreeing nor disagreeing, and 28% tending to or strongly disagreeing). Figures are only slightly different for journey cam users, but among those who have submitted to the police, 68% either strongly agree or tend to agree. The figures evidence a possible feeling of the growing normality of public journey cams, and hence the potential for further growth in use, but a substantial gap in views between road users who use journey cams and those who have used them to report incidents to the police – probably related to discussions elsewhere in this report on motivations for ownership and use.

4. Journey cams, roads policing and the Police

4.1 Awareness and knowledge

This final section moves to the more specific concerns of our project – public adoption of journey cam technology as a way to produce evidence of offences on roads, and the police response to it. We started our exploration of this side of the phenomenon with some straightforward awareness and understanding questions on 'Op Snap' and similar schemes. Awareness was fairly low across the board. For the whole sample, only 3.8% strongly agreed and an additional 9.2% tended to agree that they were "aware of Operation SNAP and similar police initiatives to accept footage from the public", and overall 17.1% agreed that they knew "how to send footage from these kinds of cameras to the police". Perhaps most interesting are responses from those who use journey cams but have never submitted footage to the police: awareness of Op Snap amongst them is overall 22.9%, and less than a third (28.8%) know how to submit footage to the police. These figures indicate that, were forces intent on increasing submissions, emphasis need not be exclusively on increasing use of cameras but on the awareness and motivations of current users and on explaining specifically how footage can be submitted. Many road users already have cameras but are just not aware of what they can do with the footage.

4.2 Submissions by modality and perceptions of victimisation

This section deals with submissions per road use modality as declared by survey respondents. Approximately 5.7% of journey cam users *regularly send footage to police*. Looking at different modalities, 2.8% of car drivers who use dash-cams and to 2.3% of pedestrians who use some form of journey cams regularly submit. The proportion of regular submitters goes up for drivers of large vehicles (~15%), and for all categories of vulnerable road users who use journey cams on the roads: 27% for motorcyclists, 10% for cyclists, 33% for horse-riders, 32% for wheelchair/mobility aid users. Almost 28% of cyclists, 27% of horse riders and 45.6% of wheelchair or other mobility aid users who use journey cams have submitted to the police at least once – while only 14.2% of drivers who use a dashcam have. Submission figures from forces, while incomplete, are roughly consistent with these trends.¹ Conversely, cars are the most common vehicle to feature *in* footage (47.5% of submitters declare to have submitted footage featuring cars), and larger motor vehicles are the second most common (25.6%). This is unsurprising given that these vehicles make up the largest group of vehicles on the roads. 24.4% of submitters said they had submitted footage of cyclists, 19.5% of motorcyclists, 16.4% of pedestrians, 15.3% of horse riders, and 13.2% of wheelchair or other mobility aid users.

These figures are complicated by varying degrees of multi-modality (which makes it difficult to gauge, for example, motivations), but there is an evident relation between submission and vulnerability in the roads – i.e. frequency of exposure to risky behaviours and perception of endangerment associated with it. These themes are explored in more detail in our Thematic Report on the issue of the submitter as a victim, or as a witness. The final section of this report deals with different dimensions of public perception of police responses to journey cam submissions.

4.3 Perception of police action and treatment by the police

The public's perception of the police taking action in response to submitted footage is generally favourable. Overall, almost half of respondents agree that *the police will use footage from these kinds of cameras to take action if necessary* – with approximately 15% disagreeing.

¹ The project also produced two surveys for police forces to complete, with the help of the National Road Crime Reporting Working Group (NRCRWG). One of them was delivered six-monthly and asked about the force's status in relation to journey cam approach (systems in place, location in the force, resourcing, general trends in submissions and outcomes). A further monthly survey asked specifically for volume of submissions and type of road users involved. It proved very difficult to obtain data from most forces (for example, only 19 of them submitted some form of monthly data between February 22 and April 23). For the most recent monthly data we obtained (March-April 2023) we recorded 3231 submissions for 12 forces (the force with the largest urban area is not included). Except for what appear to be outliers (e.g. one force for which most submitters are classed as 'others'), approximately a third of submissions come from vulnerable road users (VRUs, including in our survey cyclists, pedestrians, motorcyclists, equestrians and wheelchair/mobility aid users). For two of these twelve forces VRUs were responsible for the majority of submissions, and in the forces with the lowest proportion of VRU submissions they still accounted for around 20-25% of submissions. The majority of VRU submissions tend to be from cyclists, who tend to account for around 20-25% of any given force's submissions.

This general vote of confidence comes with caveats: more respondents also agree that *the police should be keeping the roads safe themselves, and not expecting the public to do it for them* – 48% agree vs 22% disagree. Similarly, approximately 36% of respondents agreed that *there's no point collecting my own footage because the police won't act on it*. This is relevant because, with only a small portion of the population having had direct experience with this approach, responses will necessarily be related to systemic and situational factors influencing trust in the police, as well as vicarious experiences. Direct experience of submission appears to somewhat improve trust that the police will take action: while non-users and users who have not submitted have similar levels of confidence to the general sample (between 45% and 50% agree that the police will take action amongst these groups), 64% of previous submitters trust that the police will take action.

A recurrent concern in interviews with police personnel at all levels was the use of social media to share videos of dangerous driving and other road offences. It was puzzling that a relatively rare phenomenon with little practical consequences for police business – nobody cited any actual case of road incidents whose prosecution had failed due to the submitter having uploaded the footage to social media, for example² – had such an important place in police concerns over use of journey cams. The results of our survey may hold a key to one possible explanation: asked to compare the likely effectiveness of submitting to the police with the likely effectiveness of submitting to social media, we see significant nuances, and differences between road use type appear once again as more relevant. Amongst car drivers who use journey cams, only 14% think that uploading footage to social media is more effective than submitting to the police for raising awareness, 15% believe sharing via social media is more effective for finding the person at fault, and around 14% think uploading to social media is a more effective way of attracting police attention. The proportion goes above 25% for all three forms of 'effectiveness' when respondents are those who use journey cams in their cycle rides. Half of horse riders who use journey cams think that uploading to social media is a better way of attracting police attention, and 45% of wheelchair or mobility aid users think it is a better way of raising awareness.

The headline remains that for all modalities of road use there is a reservoir of 'good will' on police action that outweighs distrust amongst both adopters and non-adopters of journey cam technologies – but these are precautionary notes that need to be taken into account, especially from the point of view of a critical section of the road using population: vulnerable road users who have adopted this approach. They are the ones underpinning this co-production of safety with the police, and will in many senses continue to drive its success or failure.

² However, the potential challenges posed by footage being shared online have been raised as a concern in some jurisdictions (Alboqami et al, 2023). Less common but also mentioned in police interviews were concerns with privacy and in particular with data protection legislation, which others have also suggested (Štitil and Laurinaitis, 2016).

A debate closely associated to the prominent and occasionally problematic situation of vulnerable road users in this emerging area of roads policing business, is whether submitters should be classed and treated as witnesses or victims. The issue featured prominently in the qualitative interviews we conducted – see our Thematic Report on this topic – and the YouGov survey gave the team an opportunity to explore the issue further. We asked journey camera users in our sample whether they felt they were the victims of, or witnesses to, some of the incidents they recorded. Respondents could pick either option, both of them, or neither of them, other statements related to the use of social media discussed in the previous section, or any combination of the above.³ Amongst all journey cam users in our sample (n=433), percentages for both those considering themselves witnesses (18.5%) or victims (15.6%) were relatively low and overlap was substantial: a third of those who chose ‘witness’ also considered themselves victims, and 40% of ‘victims’ did consider themselves ‘witnesses’ as well. From our qualitative interviews with submitters, we have learned that this is a sensitive subject for some and that labels are important in terms of experiences such as receiving feedback on the progress or outcome of a case (see our Thematic Report on this topic). In the survey element of the research ‘submitters’ were much more likely to have something to say about the issue of labelling, with much higher and almost identical proportions considering themselves witnesses (34.6%) and victims (34.3%). Conversely, fewer than 20% of journey cam users who have not submitted picked any of the options (11% consider themselves witnesses, 8% victims). Commitment to a stance on this matter increases as the contact with the police increases: more than half of respondents who *regularly* submit footage to police forces consider themselves victims of some of the incidents they have recorded (51.2%), and more than a quarter (27.5%) consider themselves both witnesses on some occasions and victims on others.

Modality is also a predictor of stances on this question, in line with the generally stronger feelings of vulnerable road users we interviewed, who were more likely to expect to be treated as a victim, especially with regards to feeling entitled to receive feedback and information. Drivers who use journey cams respond in a similar way to the general sample: 18% say they consider themselves witnesses and 15%, victims, but the majority picked neither option. Regular bicycle users tend to feel *both* more like witnesses *and* victims (26.7% and 28.5%). The increase is more accentuated in motorcyclists (31.8% and 24.9%), and even more in horse riders (48.6% and 40.3%). These figures probably indicate a higher level of personal investment amongst vulnerable road users – the gap is not as big between those who tend to consider themselves victims or witnesses (or both), but between those who are ready to put themselves into either category and those who are not. Interestingly, differences in stances by road use modality appear to shrink when only submitters are considered. However, this is hard to support with our survey data as for most groups combining road use and submission

³ Text of the options presented to respondents read: “In some of the incidents I have video recorded, I feel like I was a witness to what happened” and “In some of the incidents I have video recorded, I feel like I was a victim of what happened”.

yields numbers of respondents that are too small to raise reliable conclusions. The car driver group is sufficiently large to illustrate this though: 45% of drivers who use journey cams and have submitted to the police agreed that they consider themselves witnesses to some of the incidents, and a similarly sizeable proportion (43.6%) consider themselves victims in at least some of them. This further highlights the previous point on the importance of experiences of submission (and, as such, of contact with this area of policing) in the views of the public not only on the effectiveness of police action but in their self-perception of their role and belonging in the process.

5. Conclusions

Our YouGov survey has provided some interesting data that helps to further illuminate some of the topics covered through other methodological approaches, as well as providing some insights into new areas. The data confirms that the road user population is diverse in its expectations, motivations and experiences, and these findings need to be reflected in the way policing responds to the growth of journey cam use in future.

References

Brayne, S., Lageson, S. and Levy, K., (2023) 'Surveillance deputies: When ordinary people surveil for the state' *Law & Society Review*, 57(4), pp.462-488.

Park, S., Kim, J., Mizouni, R. and Lee, U., (2016) Motives and concerns of dashcam video sharing. In Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 4758-4769).

Kim, J., Park, S. and Lee, U., (2020) Dashcam witness: Video sharing motives and privacy concerns across different nations. *IEEE Access*, 8, pp.110425-110437.

Štitilis, D. and Laurinaitis, M., (2016) Legal regulation of the use of dashboard cameras: Aspects of privacy protection. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 32(2), pp.316-326.

Appendix 1. Questionnaire

The following questions ask about your views on dash cams, cycling cams and mobile phones which may be used by drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, horse riders and wheelchair/mobility aid users to video record what happens on the roads.

Q1. In which, if any, of the following ways do you travel regularly? By 'regularly' we mean once a month or more (Please select all that apply).

- I regularly drive a car
- I regularly drive a large vehicle (for example, a van, lorry, or tractor)
- I regularly ride a motorcycle or scooter
- I regularly ride a bicycle
- I regularly ride a horse
- I regularly use a wheelchair or mobility aid vehicle
- I regularly walk around my local area
- None of these

Q2. 'Dash cams' are small cameras that are installed in a vehicle, mounted on a vehicle's dashboard or on the windscreen and record what happens on the road throughout your journey.

Thinking about the car or large vehicle (e.g., van, lorry, tractor) that you drive the most...

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when driving a vehicle?

- I always use a dash cam when driving
- I sometimes use a dash cam when driving
- I do not use a dash cam when driving, but I am likely to consider using one in the future
- I do not use a dash cam when driving and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future
- Don't know

Q3. 'Rider cams' are small cameras that are mounted on a motorcyclist's helmet, handlebars, or clothing, and record what happens on the road throughout your journey.

Thinking about the motorcycle or scooter that you drive the most...

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when riding a motorcycle/ scooter?

- I always use a rider cam when riding a motorcycle/ scooter
- I sometimes use a rider cam when riding a motorcycle/ scooter
- I do not use a rider cam when riding a motorcycle/ scooter, but I am likely to consider using one in the future

I do not use a rider cam when riding a motorcycle/ scooter and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future
Don't know

Q4. 'Cycling cameras' (small digital cameras or mobile phone cameras for example) can be mounted on a cyclist's helmet, handlebars, seat, or clothing to record what happens on the road throughout your journey

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when cycling?

I always use a cycling camera when cycling
I sometimes use a cycling camera when cycling
I do not use a cycling camera when cycling, but I am likely to consider using one in the future
I do not use a cycling camera when cycling and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future
Don't know

Q5. 'Rider cams' are small cameras mounted on a horse rider's helmet or clothing, and record everything that happens on the road throughout your journey.

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when riding a horse?

I always use a rider cam when riding a horse
I sometimes use a rider cam when riding a horse
I do not use a rider cam when riding a horse, but I am likely to consider using one in the future
I do not use a rider cam when riding a horse and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future
Don't know

Q6. Small cameras or mobile phone cameras can be mounted on clothing, or equipment, to record everything that happens throughout your journey.

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when you use a wheelchair/ mobility aid?

I always use a camera/ phone camera to record what happens on my journeys when using a wheelchair/ mobility aid
I sometimes use a camera/ phone camera to record what happens on my journeys when using a wheelchair/ mobility aid

I do not use a camera/ phone camera to record what happens on my journeys when using a wheelchair/ mobility aid, but I am likely to consider using one in the future

I do not use a camera/ phone camera to record what happens on my journeys when using a wheelchair/ mobility aid and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future

Don't know

Q7. Mobile phone cameras can be used by pedestrians to record what happens on a journey.

Which, if any, of the following BEST describes you when you walk on streets in your local area?

I always use a mobile phone camera to record what happens on the roads when walking in my local area

I sometimes use a mobile phone camera to record what happens on the roads when walking in my local area

I do not use a mobile phone camera to record what happens on the roads when walking in my local area, but I am likely to consider using one in the future

I do not use a mobile phone camera to record what happens on the roads when walking in my local area, and I am unlikely to consider using one in the future

Don't know

Q8. Thinking about times when you travel using the roads or pavements (for example driving a car or large vehicle, riding a motorcycle, scooter or bicycle or walking).

Which, if any, of the following has happened to you in the last year (i.e., since March 2022)?

I have been involved in a collision

I have a near-miss that concerned me

Neither of these - I have not had an incident

Don't know/ can't recall

Q9. To what extent if at all do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

If I thought my behaviour on the roads was being filmed, I might drive/ ride better.

I'd feel safer on the road if there were more people using cameras to film other people's behaviour.

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q10. Thinking about your use of camera devices to record what is happening on the journeys you take...

Which ONE of the following BEST applies to you?

- I have sent footage of bad behaviour on the road to the police via a force website
- I have uploaded footage of bad behaviour on the road to a social media site
- I have both sent footage of bad behaviour on the road to the police and uploaded it to a social media site
- Not applicable - I have not sent/ uploaded any footage of bad behaviour on the road to police/ social media site
- Don't know

Q11. You previously said that you have uploaded footage of other road users from a journey you recorded onto social media/ sent it to the police...

Which, if any, of the following types of footage have you sent/ uploaded? (Please select all that apply)

- Footage of car drivers
- Footage of drivers of large vehicles (e.g. vans or lorries)
- Footage of cyclists
- Footage of horse riders
- Footage of motorcyclists
- Footage of pedestrians
- Footage of wheelchair users
- None of these
- Don't know/ Can't recall

Q12. Still thinking about all the journey footage you have recorded from dash cams, rider cams, or mobile phones etc...

Which, if any, of the following applies to you? (Please select all that apply)

- I collect footage for my own use in case I'm in a collision
- I have sent footage to the police at least once
- I regularly send footage to the police
- I find uploading footage to police sites to be straightforward
- None of these
- Don't know/ can't recall

Q13. Which, if any, of the following applies to you? (Please select all that apply)

- In some of the incidents I have video recorded, I feel like I was a witness to what happened
- In some of the incidents I have video recorded, I feel like I was a victim of what happened
- I think that uploading footage on social media sites is more effective for raising awareness than reporting to the police
- I think that uploading footage on social media sites is more effective for finding the person at fault than reporting to the police
- I think that uploading footage on social media sites is more effective way of getting the police's attention than reporting to the police
- None of these
- Don't know

Q14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about other people's use of cameras?

If more road users used cameras to record other people's behaviour on the road, this would...

Make me less anxious on the roads

Help make clear who's at fault in case of incidents or collisions

Help reduce insurance premiums

Improve my behaviour on the road

Help stop people from getting away with doing dangerous things

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q14a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about using cameras yourself?

Using a camera to record other road users would...

Make me less anxious on the roads

Protect me from people who deliberately stage accidents

Improve my behaviour on the road

Help me do my part to improve road safety

Make me feel I was spying on other road users

- Strongly agree
- Tend to agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Tend to disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

Q15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about using a camera to record other road users?

The police will use footage from these kinds of cameras to take action if necessary.

Social media and TV videos of bad behaviour on the roads encourage aggressive behaviour.

I know how to send footage from these kinds of cameras to the police.

Social media and TV videos are useful for

**shaming bad behaviour
on the roads.**

**I'm worried any footage I might
send could be used against me.**

**There's no point
collecting my own
footage because the
police won't act on it.**

**I'm aware of Operation SNAP and
similar police initiatives to accept
footage from the public.**

**We should name and
shame people who get
caught behaving
dangerously on the
roads.**

**The police should be keeping the
roads safe themselves, and not
expecting the public to do it for
them.**

**Visible cameras are
likely to make people
angrier with each other.**

**I enjoy watching footage from
these kinds of cameras online and
on TV.**

**The use of these
cameras on roads is an
invasion of other
people's privacy.**

Strongly agree

Tend to agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Tend to disagree

Strongly disagree

Don't know

**Q16. Thinking about using dash cams/ cycling cams/ rider cams, etc to record the
behaviour of road users...**

Which, if any, of the following statements do you agree with? (Please select all that apply)

These cameras are...

Sensible products for careful and considerate people who want to
make the roads safer

An unnecessary gimmick for entertainment

A great way of extending Neighbourhood Watch onto the roads

Just toys for people who like technology

Just a way to encourage vigilantes

Bad because they invade our right to privacy

For do-gooders who should mind their own business

A great way to help catch the bad guys

None of these

Don't know