

# Smile for the camera

The effect of surveillance cameras on young women in  
Stockholm, Sweden

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.2 Aim and Research Questions	6
1.3 Limitations	6
<b>2. Background</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Feminist Geography	8
3.1.1 The Feeling of Safety in Feminist Geography	8
3.2 The Right to the City	9
<b>4. Literature review</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 Surveillance in the United Kingdom and the United States	11
4.2 Surveillance cameras in urban areas	12
<b>5. Method</b>	<b>12</b>
5.1 Focus Group	13
5.1.2 Focus Group Guide	14
5.1.3 Informed Consent	14
5.1.4 Analysis of the Material	15
5.2 Observation	15
5.2.1 Autoethnographic Narrative	16
5.3 Delimitations of Methods	16
<b>6. Results and Analysis</b>	<b>17</b>
6.1 Analysis of Focus Groups	17
6.1.1 Evidence	17
6.1.2 Feeling of safety and security	18
6.1.3 Discomfort	19
6.1.4 Crime prevention	20

6.1.4 Indifference	20
6.1.5 Group Dynamic	21
6.1.6 Summary of Results	21
6.2 Observations	22
6.2.1 Analysis	22
6.2.2 Summary of observations	26
<b>7. Discussion</b>	<b>27</b>
7.1 The Effect of Surveillance Cameras and Feelings of Safety	27
7.2 The Perception of Right to the City	29
<b>8. Conclusion</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>9. References</b>	<b>32</b>

## Abstract

The city of Stockholm has increased its number of surveillance cameras in public places the last few years in the name of crime prevention. However, as the number of cameras increases, how does this affect the people living in the city? This paper examines how surveillance cameras affect young women between the ages of 18-24 and their perception in different areas around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm, Sweden, as well as how the cameras affect their perceived Right to the City. By using the theory of the *right to the city* and feminist geography and focus groups and observations as methods, this paper shows that while surveillance cameras do not affect the women who participated in the study right now, it would affect them negatively if either the number of cameras increased or if the quality of the cameras became higher. However, it is not concluded how it affects their perception of their right to the city, as it could be both positive and negative in that regard, depending on how the women perceive the cameras.

Key words: Surveillance, feminist geography, urban geography, Stockholm, right to the city

# 1. Introduction

“BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU”

- George Orwell, *1984*, pt. 1, ch. 1

The use of surveillance cameras has increased over the last few years (Majlard, 2019), with the cameras now being used in both public and private spaces. With corporations selling surveillance cameras to house owners, apartment residents and small businesses, all in the name of ‘safety and protection’, as well as the use of smartphones, we have become used to being surveilled at all times. To ‘go off the grid’ is nearly impossible in this day and age as your phone tracks your location, your interactions with other people and with applications. However, the use of surveillance cameras in public spaces is still a heated debate. Should the state be able to see where you are at all times? As more cameras are being installed in the name of safety, how does it affect the everyday lives of young women? Can we motivate the feeling of being watched at all times in the name of being possibly safe?

The subject of surveillance cameras has been discussed in both national and global politics, with the topic becoming more frequently discussed in media and debates. The idea that camera surveillance is something that increases the safety in a city has been discussed in multiple papers, with human geography often as a focal point (Koskela, 2000). This paper will however specifically look at theories regarding the right to the city, feminist geography and feeling of safety to explore the implications that surveillance cameras has on young women.

In order to research this topic from a qualitative perspective, focus groups and an observational study will be used. The focus groups consist of women between the ages of 18-24 who have either lived or currently live in Stockholm, and discussions involve how they perceive the area around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm as well as how they perceive surveillance cameras. The places discussed by the participants are then visited in an observational study by the author, in order to contribute pictures and references to the places mentioned. The material gathered is analyzed with a thematic content analysis, resulting in five main themes. These themes are evidence, feeling of safety and security, discomfort, crime prevention and indifference. These themes are used to discuss the research question, and concludes that while the feeling of safety might not be affected by the use of surveillance cameras, the right to the city might be so.

## 1.2 Aim and Research Questions

This thesis will aim to discuss and investigate the effect that surveillance cameras have on young women in Stockholm, Sweden. More specifically, the thesis focuses on how surveillance cameras at Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen affect the perception of the access to the city and the feeling of safety for young women between the ages of 18-24.

Therefore, this thesis is guided by the following research question:

How does the use of surveillance cameras around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm affect the perception of the rights of the city and feeling of safety for young women between the ages of 18-24?

## 1.3 Limitations

In order to be able to limit the amount of work to a reasonable level, this paper will only look at Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm, Sweden. These places were chosen due to them being the centrum of public transportation in Stockholm, often busy with life and people. Due to time limitations, COVID pandemic – the focus groups had to be rather small to be manageable to conduct. The COVID-pandemic decreased the possibilities to conduct the focus groups in person, as well as everyday life is rather different than from two years ago. Therefore the participants do not visit the targeted areas as much as they normally would, resulting in their reflections either being dated or not reflecting everyday life.

It is needed to acknowledge the fact that during my bachelor's studies I have previously written a paper on the feeling of safety for women in Stockholm. This paper discussed whether or not city planning could contribute to the feeling of safety for women, and concluded that more research needs to be done on the topic—for example, looking at socioeconomic factors. This thesis is therefore an expansion of this previous paper by looking at one specific aspect of safety and the urban environment (the use of surveillance cameras) in order to explain the right to the city for young women.

## 2. Background

The use of surveillance cameras has expanded over the last few decades. While countries like the United Kingdom have used them for an extended period, Sweden, China and the United States have also expanded their use of the cameras (Satariano, 2015).

The feeling of safety and its correlation with actual safety has been investigated in previous research, which conclude that the feeling is not only caused by actual crimes (Zavattaro, 2019). Other factors such as the number of people in the streets, the brightness of street lighting and the broadness of the sidewalks affect the feeling of safety as well, not just the fear of being the victim of a crime (Zavattaro, 2019).

The use of surveillance cameras in central parts of Stockholm has increased over the last few years, especially in public places. While the public transport system and stores have been heavily surveilled earlier, open areas are starting to be constantly watched by cameras as well (polisen.se). Since 2019 it is decided that all metro trains should be live-surveilled, in order for guards and police to act faster and provide the correct type of help in case of something happening (Omni, 2018). However, the metro system has been heavily surveilled before 2019, for example, the police were able to arrest Rakhmat Akilov quickly after the terror attack on Drottninggatan in 2017, thanks to looking at surveillance cameras in the metro system and providing a picture of the terrorist that could be used in media, to follow his movements through Stockholm (MSB, 2017).

According to their own website, the Swedish police only save the material recorded for two months, with the exception of material used for an investigation (polisen.se). They also use facial recognition cameras at times but “...only when absolutely necessary and only with picture material that has been collected and processed for a certain purpose, for example a current investigation” (translated by author from Swedish, polisen.se).

The use of surveillance cameras has been studied in the United Kingdom to great extent, mostly due to the fact that the use of the cameras is common in the country. Although the cameras have been used to solve murders such as the one on Milly Dowler and Amélie Delagrangé (Turner, 2019), they have not completely prevented violent crimes on women in public. Other crimes are also affected by surveillance cameras, for example while a number of studies show that surveillance cameras might prevent the sale of drugs on the street (Piza et al., 2018), drug sales have increased on the internet (Tollin et al., 2021). Relocatable crimes might therefore still take place when cameras are used.

The development of different sorts of cameras has also expanded over the years. While there are ‘classic’ surveillance cameras, also called CCTV (Closed Circuit Television), that simply capture the picture, there are also heat cameras and facial recognition cameras that work in

other ways. One might argue that the different types of cameras infringe on the individual's integrity to different extents, but they might have different effects on crime as well.

'Classic' surveillance cameras (CCTV) are cameras that capture a moving picture. These cameras can either live-send to law enforcement or private security companies or record the picture (Paessler, 2021). Facial recognition cameras that use either AI or a software program to recognize who is in the frame have been developed as well (Symanovich, 2020). This enables for law enforcement not to have to manually identify the people as the computer does it for them. This type of camera has been tried in China, but comparable technology is used in phones that allow for face recognition to be used as a passcode (Symanovich, 2020). Similar technology is already used in Automatic Number Plate Retrieval, where the camera can recognize the license plate number of vehicles (NPCC, 2021).

### 3. Theoretical Framework

This paper will use *the right to the city* theory and feminist geography to understand and analyze the effect that the use of surveillance cameras has on young women in Stockholm, Sweden.

#### 3.1 Feminist Geography

The theory and application of feminist geography in human geography is used to look at the city from the female perspective. According to Staci Zavattaro (2019) and Lisa Nelson and Joni Seager (2005), the study of geography of the city is often based on the male gaze, ignoring how different groups of people and genders look at the public space. According to Seager and Nelson, the study of urban planning has evolved partly due to feminist geography over the last decades (2005). Feminist geography has also provided new theories as the area of study has developed. With a basis in feminism and Marxism, feminist geography is often seen as a "toolbox" (Nelson & Seager, 2005, p. 2) that is used to analyze urbanization and urban life, making the female perspective an important part of the analysis.

##### 3.1.1 The Feeling of Safety in Feminist Geography

The application of feminist geography to urban planning has been exemplified in Staci Zavattaro's paper *Using feminist geography to understand feelings of safety and neighborhood* (2019). Zavattaro concludes that when it comes to behavior, women change



their pattern of movement more frequently than men and that a multitude of factors affect whether or not women feel safe. "Women report, for example, crossing the street to a more well-lit area, avoiding alleys, even avoiding doorways when navigating spaces at night." (Zavattaro, 2019, p. 193). Some of these factors include cleanliness of the street, how bright the lighting in the street is and the general upkeep of the houses (Zavattaro, 2019).

While different areas of geography discuss the feeling of safety, feminist geography sees it as a focal point of research. By using feminist geography, we can analyze how space and place is perceived by women. As mentioned earlier, well-established concepts within human geography can sometimes be ignorant to the differences different genders might experience in the urban area (Beebejuan, 2016, p. 323). With reference to other authors such as de Certeau, Beebejuan discusses how everyday experiences can be seen differently, for example walking through the city (2016). The feeling of safety will differ depending on, for example, the gender of the person, which is something that other theories besides feminist geography frequently risk to discard or not even take into consideration.

### 3.2 The Right to the City

The *right to the city* is the theory of who has access to the city and who can take part of the urban environment freely. It has been discussed by prominent authors, often with a base in marxist theory. Two of these authors are David Harvey (2008) and Henri Lefebvre (1967), who have both written extensively about the topic. Their ideas regarding the subject will therefore be used as the theoretical framework for this paper.

The *right to the city* is used in human geography as a way to describe who has access to the city. In his text *The Right to the City* (1967), Henri Lefebvre mostly discusses who the city is for – particularly focusing on the working class. In his text, Lefebvre discusses how the working class needs to act in order to get the right to the city. By "intensively elaborated urban projects" (Lefebvre, 1968, p. 155) and "a political program of urban reform" (Lefebvre, 1968, p. 155) the worker can access life in an urban area. According to Lefebvre, the right to the city has changed with the urbanization of cities and the right to the city decreases for the everyday worker as the world becomes more urban (1968, p. 159). He does, however, argue that it is necessary to change the concept from "Right to the city" to "Right to the urban life" (Lefebvre, 1968, p. 158), and that only the working class can achieve this change.

A piece of literature slightly more recent than Lefebvre but regarding the same topic and theory is David Harvey's paper *The Right to the City* (2008). In his paper, Harvey discusses the history of urban development and capitalistic thinking. He writes, "The right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access urban resources: it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city" (2008, p. 23). Harvey also claims that the right to the city is

a human right, but not one for the individual (2008). By presenting earlier urban projects and investments, Harvey talks about the effects of needing to create a monetary surplus, and how this affects the right to the city (2008). It is therefore the capitalist investments made into the city that urbanizes it, leaving the workers behind. In likeness with Lefebvre, Harvey also argues that a social revolution is needed in order to even the scales between workers and capitalists, and in that way, reclaiming the right to the city (2008. p. 40)

The idea of right to the city can be discussed from multiple perspectives, but can we apply the female perspective to it? The right to the city is, according to both Harvey and Lefebvre, a focal point in the studies of the urban city as it explains who can access the city or not. Other literature has discussed the right to the city from a feminist perspective, for example Yasminah Beebejuan. In her paper *Gender, urban space and the right to everyday life* (2016), for example, Beebejuan discusses how the concept of right to the city tends to exclude women and only look at the male perspective on urban areas. She discusses the use of the term “everyday life” in Lefebvre’s work and why it is not enough when looking at gendered space (Beebejuan, 2016, p. 325).

The theories above include different perspectives on urban life, both theories of right to the city, as well as a feminist geography perspective. When studying something which might affect young women everyday, in this surveillance cameras, both theories regarding urban life, the female perspective and urban life are needed. By using the theory of right to the city, we can try to understand how women perceive the city. However, as mentioned earlier, as this study only is regarding women and their experience, using feminist geography is also needed.

## 4. Literature review

It has been discussed whether or not surveillance cameras actually contribute to both physical safety and the feeling of safety in previously published literature and articles. While this paper examines the effect of cameras in Sweden, the use of surveillance cameras has been discussed to great extent both in the United States and the United Kingdom, therefore making them relevant examples. This section will also review a paper regarding urban environments and camera surveillance, in order to provide a greater understanding of previous research within the topic.

## 4.1 Surveillance in the United Kingdom and the United States

In his paper *Camera surveillance within the UK: Enhancing public safety or a social threat?*, Barrie Sheldon (2011) discusses the use of surveillance cameras in the United Kingdom:

“ Their presence and use raises many questions such as whether this is a phenomenon simply accepted as the norm by the general public or are there real concerns about what many believe to be a total invasion of privacy? Why are there so many cameras and how are they controlled by the state? What is their purpose and is there any evidence to suggest that they contribute to crime reduction, prevention and detection of terrorism and public safety?” (Sheldon, 2011, p. 193).

Sheldon explains both the so-called Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) and Automatic Number Plate Retrieval (ANPR)—the two types of cameras most commonly used in the UK. According to him, the United Kingdom had the highest number of CCTV-cameras per capita in the world in 2011, and that around a little less than 70 times a day, the average citizen is caught on surveillance cameras (Sheldon, 2011).

Sheldon comes to the conclusion that surveillance cameras, or CCTV and ANPR as he refers to them, has not had the significant effect on counter terrorism and crime prevention as first believed that they would (Sheldon, 2011). It can, however, be more effective if combined with lighting of the street and signs disclosing that a camera is recording (Sheldon, 2011.). The surveillance cameras can also help with solving crimes, especially ANPR that can track how a vehicle has moved (Sheldon, 2011).

Other than Barrie Sheldon, Christopher Slobogin has written about camera surveillance in the United States. In his article *Public Privacy: Camera surveillance of public places and the right to anonymity* (2002), he discusses the use of surveillance from a legal perspective. With a basis in the right to anonymity, Slobogin discusses how the citizen should keep their privacy protected—even in public places (2002). According to the author, “the right to anonymity” in public places should be valued highly- something that is compromised by cameras recording us in these places (Slobogin, 2002, p. 239). While arguing from a legal point of view, Slobogin points to the fact that a citizen of a state cannot move and act freely if recorded (Slobogin, 2002). ” Anonymity in public promotes freedom of action and an open society. Lack of public anonymity promotes conformity and an oppressive society” (Slobogin, 2002, p. 240).

## 4.2 Surveillance cameras in urban areas

Besides previous literature regarding certain geographical places and their relationship to camera surveillance, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, literature regarding urban space and surveillance cameras will be presented as well. In her paper '*The gaze without eyes*': *video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space*, Hille Koskela discusses how camera surveillance affects the urban city (2000). Koskela discusses the different types of space: "power-space", "emotional space" and "space as a container", and how surveillance cameras change them (2000, p. 248). According to Koskela, space as a container means the physical space of a place, and that surveillance cameras can create bigger alienation (2000). She then proceeds to discuss how "gendered space" is affected by the cameras and that the cameras can increase an unequal "dynamic of power" between men and women (Koskela, 2000, p. 254-260). Koskela also argues that women tend to be the ones surveilled, while men are the ones who look at the videos (2000).

While these examples provide us with a basis of the literature produced in the area, the use of camera and how young women specifically, experience it could be further researched. This paper aims to provide an understand of this, although more extensive research is necessary. By combining the theories presented in Section 3 with the literature presented in this section, as well as the results presented in Section 6, this study tries to answer the research question: "How does the use of surveillance cameras around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm affect the perception of the rights of the city and feeling of safety for young women between the ages of 18-24?".

## 5. Method

Due to the fact that this thesis analyzes subjective feelings and perceptions around surveillance cameras, a qualitative research approach will be used through focus groups and an observational study to understand how women between the ages of 18-24 perceive surveillance cameras around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen of Stockholm, Sweden. The observational study will provide the reader with pictures, reflections and the different narratives produced through group discussions. The observations are therefore an important part of the thesis as they enable the reader to understand the targeted area even if they have not been to the place in question and they add context to what the focus groups are referring to.

## 5.1 Focus Group

The focus group method works in the way that a small group of participants are interviewed together, with a few questions and themes prepared by the interviewer. The focus group method encourages the interaction and discussion between the interviewees, allowing them to elaborate their ideas and thoughts (Liamputtong, 2011).

Within feminist research, focus groups are often seen as a method that allows women to speak freely and share their experiences (Liamputtong, 2011). While methods that use quantitative statistics do not always take the female perspective specifically into account, using a focus group allows the researcher to ask specific questions regarding the female experience. This may increase the feeling of “being seen” for the female participants, allowing them to answer more truthfully and freely (Liamputtong, 2011, p.7).

In this thesis, two groups will be used with five or six participants in each group. In order to get participants for the study, a purposive sampling method is used, followed by a snowball sampling method, where the interviewer asks six of the participants to suggest one friend to participate. The purposive sampling is based on the criteria of being between the ages of 18-24 woman who has either lived or lives in Stockholm and is familiar to the author. The participants will then be split into two groups, making sure that everyone knows at least one more person in her group. This is to increase the likelihood of the participants to feel comfortable to speak freely. The aim of the focus group is to create a discussion between the participants and that they can develop and elaborate on their ideas freely. As a moderator of the interview, the aim is to ensure that everyone feels comfortable enough to speak, which then includes distributing who speaks if needed. The groups will meet for around one hour each, allowing the participants to take their time to answer and discuss the questions.

The focus groups will take place on Zoom, allowing the participants to speak freely in the comfort of their own home. The focus group will be recorded, both with picture and sound, and the audio will be transcribed. In order to make sure that the participants are cited correctly, the screen will be recorded to make the transcription easier and more accurate. Having the camera turned on also enables the participants to connect to one another, as well making it easier to create a discussion. The focus group will be conducted in Swedish in order to promote the participants to speak more freely, and then relevant citations will be translated into English.

Another challenge is the group dynamic that might surface during the focus groups. In order to minimize the risk of one person being completely quiet or one person talking constantly, the groups will be mixed up so that everyone knows at least one person, but a maximum of two. This will hopefully increase the feeling of comfort for the participants while minimizing the risk of previous group dynamics affecting the results. The groups were able to talk with

each other before the recording was turned on, in order for them to feel more comfortable to discuss the different topics later on. However, due to the discussion taking place on Zoom, the participants did not discuss the questions to the extent that was expected. While Zoom enables participants to participate even if they feel sick or live far away from each other, the natural flow of a conversation is lost due to microphones being turned off, poor internet connection and not being able to see when someone is about to speak in the same extent that is possible during a conversation in-person. The positive effects of using a focus group in feminist research might have disappeared, due to it not taking place in person.

### 5.1.2 Focus Group Guide

The groups will be presented with the following questions to help guide the discussion:

1. How often do you travel or pass by the central parts of Stockholm?
2. What do you think of the environment there?
3. Do you ever think about surveillance cameras?
4. What do you think about the cameras, how do you feel about them?
5. How do you feel about the cameras?
6. Do you feel more or less safe with the cameras being there?
7. What are the Pros and Cons of surveillance cameras?

### 5.1.3 Informed Consent

The focus groups will take place online, and the participants see each other over the service Zoom. It is therefore important that the interviewees are aware of the fact that they will be seeing the other participants, which will be discussed beforehand. They will receive a written thesis statement and explanation of the use of the interview before the interview takes place. This ensures that they know what the information collected will be used for and also informs them that they are free to interrupt and stop their participation at any time. One positive aspect of using Zoom is that the participants, besides giving their consent to be recorded beforehand, has to accept the recording being started by either choosing “yes” or “no” when the host of the meeting starts the recording.

In order to be able to transcribe and capture the focus groups’ discussions, the meetings will be recorded with both video and sound. The participants will therefore be asked privately if they consent to being recorded before the recording is turned on as well as once more when it started. They will also be informed that they can choose to leave at any time and that the parts of their participation will be deleted.

#### 5.1.4 Analysis of the Material

After conducting the focus groups, the material from the groups needs to be analyzed. When it comes to focus groups, the material can be analyzed and discussed on two levels: both on an individual level and a group dynamic level (Liamputtong, 2015). By first looking at what the individuals say, we can get a better understanding of certain opinions and expressions, while the group level can bring us an understanding of the group dynamic and overall themes (Bloor et al., 2011).

The transcript will first be divided by the questions the group is asked, in order to ease the analysis and indexing. The answers provided by the group will first be indexed by different themes, for example “safety”, “integrity”, “cameras” etc. These can be analyzed freely and contribute to understanding how young women might perceive surveillance cameras. However, the group dynamic is a relevant factor in a focus group (Liamputtong, 2015).

### 5.2 Observation

The use of observational studies in qualitative research can be seen as the author observing and taking part of the place in question. This thesis will therefore include a participant observation (Bryman, 2016) where the actual action of being in the targeted area makes the observer non-passive. While some might argue that simply walking in the city is a non-participant observation (Allen, 2017), feminist theory would argue otherwise. Walking around in the city can be seen as a passive action, but being a part of the city and taking a place as a woman is an active action (Beebejuan, 2017).

The observations will be conducted by taking a walk between the central station of Stockholm and the metro station T-Centralen’s exit: Sergels torg, also called “Plattan”. The two observations will take place during different times of the day: one during daylight and one during the evening when the sun has set and the only light comes from street lighting. This is to observe whether the place feels different during different times of the day. Factors that might affect this are the amount of people moving around, the number of police present and the amount of light shed on the place.

In order to compliment my own observational notes, two other women, who are not participants in the focus groups, in the targeted age group of between the ages of 18-24 years old will accompany me on the observations. They will discuss what they see, how they perceive the different spaces and simply talk about the area. This will not be recorded, and the notes from the observations will be the basis of the analysis.

### 5.2.1 Autoethnographic Narrative

Due to the fact that I am a young woman in the targeted age-range of between the ages of 18-24 who lived in Stockholm for 18 years, I will also include my own experiences and reflections during the observations. This is to present my narrative as both researcher and research subject, and how my own personal experience might affect this paper. That means that the notes taken from the observation will be used to look at the topic of surveillance cameras from an autoethnographic perspective.

Autoethnography is a combination of autobiography and ethnography, where the researcher reflects on how their own experiences might affect their work (Ellis, et. al. 2011. p. 275). This paper will use a layered account approach, where the researcher uses their own narrative as a compliment to already existing data (Ellis, et. al. 2011). In this case the existing data is the data collected through the focus groups as well as the reflections from the two other participants in the observations.

### 5.3 Delimitations of Methods

The study is limited to people that identify as female. This is mainly because the male perspective is not relevant to the research question, and as the male perspective is often the basis for city planning, this paper aims to provide a different perspective. The sample of young women will also be limited since some focus group participants are known to the author. This will however be slightly compensated by using the snowball effect – where each participant is asked to suggest another participant. In order to minimize the risk of just one certain viewpoint being reflected in the paper, the participants asked were chosen to reflect different political viewpoints. An intersectional approach to selecting participants was considered, with ethnic diversity, different socioeconomic backgrounds and LGBTQ+ being represented, but under-represented in regard to the general population, in the focus groups.

The choice to only look at women between the ages of 18-24 is based on the results from the Nationella Trygghetsundersökningen 2021 as they are the group that feels the least safe in their own neighborhood, are most likely to change their way of transportation and are most likely to choose not to participate in an activity (NTU, 2021).

The focus groups will be rather small, around 5-6 participants in each. As mentioned above this is due to making the study manageable to conduct, as larger groups or an increased number of groups would be unmanageable. This results in the groups not representing the whole female population between the ages of 18-24. However, due to this being a qualitative study that aim to investigate feeling and a perception, being able to generalize is not the focal point. The study is also rather limited in terms of intersectionality and does not consider factors such as socio-economic status and ethnicity as main factors.



While previous statistics on the area might be useful, this will not be included in the paper. This is due to the fact that this paper specifically will focus on how the use of surveillance cameras affect the feeling of right to the city for young women, and including quantitative data that might exist goes outside the scope of this particular study.

By only choosing one area to look at: the central parts of Stockholm around the Central Station, this paper is limited to a small area. While this can result in the paper being too narrow, the point is not to create a generalized picture. With choosing a small space and place, we enable for both the focus groups and the observations to work within the same limits. If no case was chosen, the risk of being too scattered could arise. The choice of looking at one small area is therefore simply to make sure that both the interviewees and the interviewer are on the same page, which might result in a discussion, rather than reflections.

## 6. Results and Analysis

This section will present the results from the methods presented in Section 5, focus groups and the observations. Both methods were conducted in tandem, with the analysis of the observations providing an understanding of my role as an author, as well as pictures of the places discussed in the focus groups.

### 6.1 Analysis of Focus Groups

Throughout the both focus groups, the same topics and questions were raised. While the two groups got the same questions, the same amount of time and information, the answers differed heavily in some aspects. This section will present and discuss the themes that most frequently occurred during both focus groups, as well as what could have affected the different outcomes regarding the answers. The main themes identified include evidence, feeling of safety and security, discomfort, crime prevention, and indifference. I also reflect on how the results may have been affected due to the group dynamic within each focus group.

#### 6.1.1 Evidence

On the theme of evidence, both groups argued that surveillance cameras were mostly good for one thing: collecting evidence if something were to happen. However, they did come to different conclusions in their discussions. While group A felt like surveillance cameras were to prefer over videos recorded by a phone, group B came to the opposite conclusion. This results in a 50/50 split- meaning that there is no generally spread opinion on the subject. Group A argued that a video captured by a phone only shows a chosen course of events, group B talked about how phone-recordings can be used when proving ‘the State’s’ wrongdoings against its citizens. Group B also discussed how the quality of the picture might make surveillance cameras useless and that they too can be edited.

They also discussed the fact that ‘the State’ can choose whether they release footage of an incident or not, making the power dynamic between state and citizen more uneven. Group B tended to discuss the role of ‘the State’ much more than group A, and the power dynamic between citizen and state. This could be due to a multiple of factors, such as what the participants study, what experiences they have and if they are politically active. Only one of the participants mentioned that ideology might affect her answers, but one cannot discard the possibility of others being affected by ideology as well.

One participant in focus group A brought up the fact that many situations and conflicts are recorded by phone nowadays, and while these might have a greater quality of the picture, they do not record the whole situation. They started to discuss whether or not a video recorded on a phone is any different from a surveillance camera, and came to the conclusion that the phone-video felt less reliable but also more of an intrusion to their integrity. Focus group B, on the other hand, discussed the use of cell-phone cameras and how they are more positively inclined towards these. In the case of the state abusing its citizens, the participants felt like they trust a film recorded on a camera more as the state would not release pictures that incriminate itself. One focus group member argued that the use of cell-phone camera videos somewhat ‘even the score’ between state and citizen, naming the Black Life Matters demonstrations as an example of where a phone-recorded video, more specifically the video of the murder of George Floyd, resulted in demonstrations and action towards ‘the State’. They did however discuss the risk of edited videos, but claimed that this could be done with surveillance cameras too.

### 6.1.2 Feeling of safety and security

When asked about the feeling of safety and whether surveillance cameras increase it or decrease it, the answers from all participants were nearly the same besides two. The majority felt like the cameras did not affect their feeling of safety, even if they claimed to be uncertain if they liked them or not. In group A they argued that what they feel might not be relevant, as ‘public safety’ might be more important than their own integrity.

While discussing the safety that might be provided by cameras, both groups discussed how the camera is placed somewhere for a reason, and that this might indicate that the place is not safe after all. However, one participant claimed to feel more safe when a place is being ‘caught on camera’, while another participant claimed that it decreased her feeling of safety. This participant did however describe ‘experienced safety’ as “Bullshit”, something that might conflict with the feeling of safety.

They also discussed how being around other people increased their feeling of safety more, since other people can react if something were to happen, unlike a camera that only can prove

something afterwards. One of the participants expressed that specifically police and security guards increased her feeling of safety, something which another participant did not agree with as she only had negative experiences with security guards.

Group A discussed the need to be around other women in order to feel safe and group B talked about needing to be around other people that felt ‘non-threatening’, such as elderly couples or people in their forties. Whether these are concerns that would have been voiced in a group discussion containing men as well is not impossible, but it can be possible that it could have increased their level of comfort by only speaking to other women. This could be due to the fact that they all share the experience of either being or have been young women in the ages of 18-24.

### 6.1.3 Discomfort

The theme of discomfort in different constellations was discussed in both groups. While one group discussed the physical discomfort of being at T-Centralen, Sergels torg (Plattan) and the Central Station of Stockholm, the other group discussed the discomfort of camera surveillance and an unequal power dynamic between state and citizen. This shows that the question is multifaceted- where physical discomfort is put against conceptual discomfort.

Regarding how the participants perceive the targeted places, one participants answered: “There are a lot of people, and overall chaos” (Group A participant) when asked what they thought of T-Centralen, Sergels torg and Centralstationen . All of the participants of group A agreed that there are a lot of people constantly moving around in the metro station, while some found it more stressful than others. One participant talked about “being a part of the crowd” as a requirement to not be overwhelmed and that keeping the same pace as everyone else is a necessity.

Group B discussed how different levels of surveillance could be an infringement of their integrity, where facial recognition cameras and high-resolution pictures felt more like an intrusion of their integrity. They argued that if the videos had a higher quality, their discomfort would increase. While some participants felt like the camera and being recorded itself was not ‘that big of a deal’, the use and storing of the videos were. The issue of not knowing how the surveillance videos are stored and who looks at them felt uncomfortable for the participants. Group A also discussed how expanded use of cameras would be a violation of their integrity, but did not explain why they thought so.

One can also discuss the potential discomfort of the focus group itself. For example, one participant described herself as naive multiple times, where she frequently used the phrase “... but I don’t know” after sentences that either provided an opinion or information. This is commonly used by women when discussing different topics, in order to prevent themselves

from being criticized by men and not speak out on something they have uttermost confidence in knowing (Stoeffel, 2014).

#### 6.1.4 Crime prevention

While discussing the discomfort that surveillance cameras might bring, the two groups discussed crime prevention, or the justification of surveillance in ‘the name of crime prevention’. As none of the groups had reflected on cameras to any great extent before the interview, neither were certain about the actual statistics regarding the cameras.

Group A assumed that it might lower crime rates in a certain place, while group B discussed why this might be due to relocation of crime. Both of the groups did however argue that people who have the intent to commit a crime will probably disregard the cameras, and wear masks and other disguises if needed. They therefore felt like surveillance cameras might not stop someone in, for example, organized crime to commit a crime, but it might stop someone who only has considered it. For example, one participant joked about crime prevention, seemingly having a casual relationship with surveillance cameras, as she throughout the focus group joked about “showing a peace-sign for the camera” and “I don’t plan to do anything” (Group A participant).

Group B discussed that a negative aspect of camera surveillance is the violation of personal integrity and how surveillance cameras are more likely to affect people with no criminal intent, instead of gang members and organized crime. They discussed how the use of surveillance cameras are a “quick fix” in crime prevention, but that it most likely will not fix any problems when it comes to organized crime. One participant questioned whether it is justifiable for ‘the State’ to surveil all people in ‘the name of preventing crime’, something she was uncertain about.

#### 6.1.4 Indifference

One thing that a majority of the participants had in common was that they were indifferent towards surveillance cameras, even if they had opinions and concerns regarding the subject. If one regards surveillance cameras as a violation of privacy and integrity, how come one does not care if they are ‘caught on tape’?

Participants in group A argued that while the cameras might be uncomfortable for themselves, the evidence that the cameras might provide in a criminal investigation ‘makes up’ for that. One of the participants reflected on why she had not thought about surveillance cameras before, and she came to the conclusion that it might be due to privilege. Another member of the group had earlier discussed that someone who is homeless or a refugee without

asylum might feel like the camera is a bigger invasion of their privacy as when a citizen who has a legal right to be there “has nothing to worry about” (Group A participant).

The participants of group B argued that the cameras were an intrusion of their privacy and integrity, but that they did not mind the cameras in public spaces. For example, one participant expressed that cameras do not give her any sense of increased safety, but that she tends to notice cameras indoors or in enclosed spaces more frequently. She claimed that she “does not necessarily appreciate them” (Group B participant) or that she was indifferent towards them.

### 6.1.5 Group Dynamic

The group dynamic within the groups may have affected the discussion and the answers. In group A there were three outspoken participants. These participants were quick to answer the questions, agreed with each other’s statements and questioned other participants about their opinions. As two of them were familiar with each other, this could have given them the confidence to speak out and voice their opinions.

In focus group A, the participants agreed with each other on almost every question. While some participants were more likely to be positively inclined towards surveillance cameras in general, none of the participants viewed them as an issue or infringement on their integrity. They all agreed that the cameras can be a positive key component in solving crimes. They also agree to not have reflected over surveillance before, something that might indicate that it is not an issue for them in general.

The discussion in group B was heavily driven by one participant who took a very political stance when answering the questions. However, the fact that the group did not unanimously agree on all questions can be seen as something positive, where the group dynamic did not influence the possibility to question one another. While some participants did not speak as much as others, their contributions lead the conversation forward.

### 6.1.6 Summary of Results

The focus groups enable the participants to express both concerns and opinions, especially regarding what makes them feel safe and what makes them feel less safe. The feelings and perceptions regarding surveillance cameras cannot be generalized from this small group of women, but their answers differ to the extent that no summary of their experience as a whole can be made. It can be said, however, that a majority of the participants felt indifferent towards the cameras and that they do not affect their feeling of safety to any great extent, even if they had some negative perceptions of them.

However, they all came to the conclusion that the cameras might have a different effect on different people, and the use of them often is motivated by “prevention of crime”, even though they questioned whether this was reasonable or not. One thing that both groups raised as concerns were increased quality of picture and number of cameras and how this can affect their integrity negatively.

## 6.2 Observations

The observations took place at Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm. The two were conducted at different times of the day, one at 11:30 on a weekend, and the other one at around 20:00 on a weekday. Due to the sun setting around 14:50 in Stockholm in late December, the ‘late observation’ was still conducted at night in order to be comparable to other times of the year.

While the observation conducted by day was done alone, the one at night was accompanied by two female friends who did not participate in the focus groups, as more than one perceptive on the places could be necessary. The one conducted at night was, however, an uncomfortable experience as I was physically approached and cat-called during the observation, which I have reflected on in my analysis.

### 6.2.1 Analysis

As a young woman from Stockholm, it is possible that my own views are likely to affect the research conducted in this paper, due to previous experiences and thoughts. This section will therefore discuss how my own experiences might affect my research, and what my role is in this paper. When I live in Stockholm, I had to commute and switch trains at T-Central during my last year of high school, which means I traveled through the central parts of Stockholm often. When meeting up with friends, Sergels Torg was the place we met up. I never thought about whether the place was being surveilled or not. As I moved from Stockholm to Lund in 2018, before the implementation of constant camera surveillance on all metro trains, I really never experienced that.

When conducting my observations, I realized that the place was less crowded than I would have thought. This may have been due to the times I chose to observe, but I did imagine it to be more busy this close to Christmas (19/12-21). Had I chosen the wrong dates to observe the places? Was this giving the correct picture of Sergels torg, Centralstationen and T-Centralen? I realized, however, that I mostly have experienced T-Centralen during rush hours at 7:40 in the morning, and that I needed to move beyond my own view of how the places ‘should’ be in order to not affect the results and the conclusions of this paper.



Figure 1: Photo by author, 2021-12-19, Sergels Torg

The observation during daytime was eventless, just a ‘normal’ day in Stockholm during winter time. I decided to take pictures of the places mentioned in the focus groups, however I felt like they did not do the place justice: you cannot photograph a feeling. As I sat outside of Kulturhuset (see Figure 1), I began to wonder why I was taking the notes that I did. Why did I find it fascinating whether the group of friends at the corner of Sergels torg was waiting for someone or if they were going to join the DJ in his things? I realized that if they had joined him, the music was likely to be turned on, and I would get uncomfortable. As one of the Participants mentioned in focus group B, there are often different demonstrations taking place at Sergels Torg, some in which you do not know if you support or not. I was scared to be included in this.

As I moved around Sergels Torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen, I thought about how weird it would look if someone were to actually look at the recorded material from the surveillance cameras scattered around the station (see Figure 2). There I was, walking around and taking pictures and writing notes in my notebook. What would they think? I felt like I was doing something you are not supposed to do, even if I did not take pictures of people, just the places. While others walking around was preparing for the holidays, I took photos and notes. I felt displaced. I was not taking part of the rush and the tempo of the place, which could have increased my stress level.



Figure 2: Photo by author, 2021-12-19, Stockholm Central Station

During the observation at night time, I was approached and cat-called by a man in his thirties. This made me very uncomfortable, but I was glad not to be alone. I however fear that this might have affected my views on the central parts of Stockholm, as a woman you cannot be left alone. Even if it just happened one time, it still made me uncomfortable. Had I been alone, I would have most likely cried or called a friend. However, I did not feel like the cameras would have helped me at all. Walking close to someone is not illegal, and while catcalling can be seen as a sort of harassment, the cameras do not record sound. The camera would only have recorded a man accompanied by two women, walking incredibly close to a young woman, nothing else. Somehow it almost made me feel like the camera would affect me negatively, as it would prove that he did not physically attack me.

The two other participants reflected that while the area around Sergels torg is covered in lights, it is still quite dark. While the large shopping street Drottninggatan is full of people at day time, it is both empty and dark during the night, mostly due to the stores being closed. The lack of restaurants and brightly-lit stores made it clear to them that especially Drottninggatan is a place to visit during the day. We questioned why there are so many signs and cameras all over Sergels Torg. I asked how they felt about the cameras, and they answered with indifference, pointing out that it did not stop me from being catcalled, or increasing their feeling of safety. They did however argue, in the same way as the focus groups, that it felt good that if they were physically attacked, it would be recorded. After I was catcalled, they immediately asked me how I was feeling. It made me feel safer, but also



worry about them. Would they get home safely? As we waved goodbye one of the participants said, “Text me when you get home”— something that I have told female friends multiple times as well.



Figure 3 : Photo by author, 2021-12-19, Sergels Torg

During my observations, I realized that even if the police have signs that indicate that you are being recorded, you cannot see the cameras. I actively looked for them, but could not find them. I saw one or two outside of a store (see Figure 3), but none of them were located to see Sergels Torg. I made the opposite observation at Centralstationen and T-Centralen, where I could see loads of cameras (see Figure 4), but not that many visible signs that informed me that the place was being surveilled. It somewhat felt intentional, that the police informs the public more frequently about surveillance, I simply assumed that it was to scare people away from committing crimes.



Figure 4 : Photo by author, 2021-12-19, T-Centralen

### 6.2.2 Summary of observations

In conclusion, the observations provided both photos and a reference point to the places discussed in the focus groups. By observing the places both during day and night time, a bigger picture of how the places are perceived was created. The observations provided a background for the autoethnographic narrative, that enabled me as an author to understand the references in the focus groups more extensively.

Unfortunately, the observation taking place at night time was rather short, due to one of the participants feeling very uncomfortable even though there were three of us taking part. However, this observation showed that women can feel such a lack of safety that they remove themselves from the area, even with the cameras and being accompanied by other women.

## 7. Discussion

Due to the fact that this thesis does not aim to generalize the answers provided in Section 6, this discussion will aim to combine theories of Right to the City and the toolbox of feminist geography in order to try and answer the research question proposed in Section 1.2: “How does the use of surveillance cameras around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen of Stockholm affect the perception of the rights of the city and feeling of safety for young women between the ages of 18-24?”

### 7.1 The Effect of Surveillance Cameras and Feelings of Safety

With the use of surveillance cameras in public spaces increasing, the effect it has on young women, more specifically in the ages of 18-24 years old, can be discussed. While the cameras are mostly used in the public transportation of Stockholm, they are also used at Sergels torg in Stockholm, this besides private camera surveillance such as in stores and restaurants. As most of the participants in the focus groups used public transport in order to visit Sergels torg, T-Centralen and the Central Station, discussing the metro trains might be relevant as well. The participants in the focus groups brought up the platforms of T-Centralen as a specific area of concern and discomfort, as well as taking the metro home late at night.

As mentioned in Section 2, the police have increased the number of public places that are surveilled, as well as expanding the surveillance of the public transport system to cameras that live send to a central, in order to more easily provide the right type of help in case of an emergency (Omni, 2018). However, this has resulted in that the metro is constantly surveilled, even when no incidents occur. Some of the participants argued that being surveilled felt comforting if something were to happen, such as being pushed in front of a train or harassed by men, but that the recordings would only help afterwards. The participants did however discuss whether providing the correct help is possible without cameras, as being surrounded by other people ‘who feel safe’ is the main factor to them feeling safe as it is the only thing that might help in the moment.

The focus groups, which results can be found in Section 6, discussed whether they felt safer or not with surveillance cameras and came to the conclusion that the majority of the participants felt indifferent towards it. If the cameras are used in order to increase safety, why are they not increasing the feeling of safety and security for women? It could be that the cameras are not meant for women and their sense of safety, but to increase actual security (Koskela, 2000). However, Koskela argues that the cameras might not increase actual security either, depending on who is behind the cameras (2000).

While the cameras surrounding Sergels Torg are ‘owned’ by the Swedish police, the ones at for example the Central Stations are monitored by a publicly owned company: Jernhusen

(jernhusen.se). As some of the participants expressed in the focus groups: not knowing who is looking at the material gathered from the cameras, what it is used for and how it is saved causes a feeling of discomfort. The idea of someone watching your every move in a public place made them feel uncomfortable, but not to the level that they felt like it decreased their feeling of safety. However, it made them reflect on what they are actually doing while out in public. While eating, picking at your face or adjusting your clothes is nothing illegal, they consider it awkward that someone would see that part of their everyday life through a camera, even when people around them can see it directly.

Why is the female perspective of surveillance to an extent disregarded? By using a feminist perspective on both geography and the feeling of safety, how does the camera affect the young women who participated in the focus groups? The notion that cities are built for and by the male gaze are one of the key arguments to why feminist geography is needed (Nelson, Lisa & Joni Seager, 2005). If the city is built for men, is crime prevention built for men as well? The women in the focus groups discussed that while surveillance cameras might be a 'quick fix' to gang criminality, it is not a solution. Some of the participants regarded the cameras as 'collective punishment' for a few individuals' illegal actions.

If one does subscribe to the notion that the city is built for men, does this apply to the use of cameras? While men make up the majority of criminals in Sweden, the cameras affect everyone, not just the people they are intended to stop. As Koskela discusses in her paper, public harassment towards women is not always physical (2000). For example, sexually explicit comments can be a type of harassment, but nothing that a camera can prevent or prove, since it neither records sounds or intervenes when something is said (Koskela, 2000). The video recorded might help to prove physical attacks, but as mentioned above, verbal attacks are not affected by the surveillance camera. For example, during the observation taking place at night, I was cat-called by a man who approached me and put his face about 10 centimeters from mine. While the physical approach could be seen on a camera, walking close to someone is not a crime. However, due to his comments, I felt immensely uncomfortable, something which cannot be proven in a recording.

A number of questions were brought up during both the focus groups and the observations: Is crime prevention affecting women in a negative way? How come women accept cameras even if they do not increase their feeling of safety? Are the female perspective included when implementing laws and regulations that allow for more surveillance cameras? This could be researched by interviewing legislation makers, politicians and city planners, as well as conducting a larger scale survey on how women perceive surveillance cameras and their own safety.

In conclusion, the focus groups and observations showed that the surveillance cameras might not affect young women's feeling of safety to any major extent, but that when asked they do

reflect upon it. It is also evident that there is no uniform consensus of thought regarding surveillance, and that not all young women feel the same way. However, it is also concluded that the women participating in the study are positive towards the cameras regarding providing proof criminal investigations but that this does not affect their overall feeling of safety. Furthermore, the study shows that feelings are difficult to study, and a larger group of participants would be needed in order to produce a generalizable result.

## 7.2 The Perception of Right to the City

As the world becomes more urbanized (Fridberg, 2017), the right to the city decreases for the everyday worker (Lefebvre, 1968). As the female perspective is to an extent excluded from the theory of Right to the City, the definition of access to the city will be used for this analysis (Beebejwan, 2016). With right to the city meaning access to the city, the theory can be applied to women instead of workers as a group.

The first question that needs to be discussed is whether the young women in the focus groups have an overall perception of their access to the city. By asking how they perceive the both physical and social environment around T-Centralen, Sergels torg and the Central Station it is evident that nine out of ten focus group participants found the place stressful, ugly and uncomfortable to be at. Two participants even claimed to actively avoid T-Centralen and Sergels torg specifically, and others described it as a place only to pass through. This indicates that there are places in Stockholm that some women might not feel like they have access to due to a decreased feeling of safety.

The results of the study illuminated several important questions; How come they feel indifferent towards being recorded, but at the same time feeling like increased camera surveillance would be a violation of their integrity? Could it be that women are so used to feeling uncomfortable in public places that another factor, in this case the camera, does not matter to them? Are the other components to the urban environment more important than the existence of surveillance cameras when it comes to access to the city? As the women mentioned in the focus groups, being around other women is what makes them feel safe and secure. This could possibly due to the fact that an another woman can intervene if something were to happen, which the cameras can not. As the participants of the focus groups discussed, women can keep an eye out for each other in public. Another factor to this is the feeling of recognition. Another woman might be more able to understand why something feels uncomfortable or not safe. When being catcalled during the observations, the other two women were directly comforting and supporting, something which a camera can not be.

While the existence of cameras might not affect their perception of their access and right to the city, does it affect it in practice? As Beebejwan (2017) discusses in her paper, the factors of right to the city are different for women and men. Being able to walk in the city, take part

in its activities and take up space in public places is nothing that is not a sure thing for women. As the cameras can provide a false sense of safety, as mentioned above, it is possible that the cameras actually improve the women's feeling of right to the city, when it in fact does not. If women are under the perception that the cameras will prevent crime, or at least contribute with recorded material that can be of use in a criminal investigation, they might be more comfortable being in public places. However, this was not what the answers provided in the focus groups concluded: that the cameras increase their feeling of safety. It might therefore be necessary to conduct a survey on a larger scale regarding the subject, in order to get a generalizable answer, representing a larger number of women.

One question that arose during the focus groups is whether the right to the city and integrity are mutually exclusive factors. As a number of participants in the focus groups claimed that an increasing number of surveillance cameras would be a violation of their integrity, while at the same time might be able to provide more evidence, is it that decreased integrity could result in an increased right to the city? If that is the case, which should be prioritized when creating urban areas? Further research should therefore consider how women's sense of safety and their access to the city might influence new directions in urban planning.

## 8. Conclusion

This paper has discussed and looked at how some women, in the ages of 18-24, perceive surveillance cameras and the use of them at Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen in Stockholm, Sweden. The study aimed to answer the research question: "How does the use of surveillance cameras around Sergels torg, T-Centralen and Centralstationen of Stockholm affect the perception of the rights of the city and feeling of safety for young women between the ages of 18-24?". While the number of people interviewed is not enough to generalize for the whole female population, this group of women had similar experiences and thoughts and offers insights into how urban space surveilled by cameras might be perceived. While looking at quantitative statistics might create a bigger picture, feelings are difficult to quantify, meaning that a qualitative study might provide us with a more in depth understanding of feelings. While this study is small, it can help us to develop future research, as it raises questions and discussions.

By using theories regarding the right to the city, feminist geography as well as previous literature regarding use of surveillance cameras in the United States and the United Kingdom, this paper has presented a background of material in order to answer the research question. This was followed by a methods section, presenting the two qualitative methods and the reasoning to why they are used in tandem, in order to provide a more clear picture. Using feminist geography when researching how women perceive the city is crucial, as women and

men might experience the cities in different ways. By using focus groups we can increase the level of comfort for the women participating, as they all share the experience of being young women. By using feminist geography as an approach, as well as focus groups and observations as methods, an aspect that might disappear when using quantitative data is brought up: reflections of the personal experience. While statistics might indicate how many women feel safe, using a qualitative method allows us to understand why they feel so, to an extent. Feminist geography highlights issues that other theories might exclude, making it relevant to a study regarding how women perceive an aspect of urban life.

The focus group's discussion resulted in five main themes: evidence, feeling of safety and security, discomfort, crime prevention and indifference. These themes built the basis of the discussion in Section 7. With a brief summary of the groups we can see that they argued that while the use of cameras neither increases or decreases their feeling of safety or right to the city considering the use of them now, they believe that increased camera surveillance would decrease their integrity, as someone could see what they are doing at all times. With an increasing number of cameras, more questions of 'why are they there?' surface, instead of increasing their feeling of safety. They also expressed concerns about the increased quality of pictures taken by surveillance cameras, with facial recognition cameras bringing the most worry. However, they do appreciate the cameras being able to help with criminal investigations if something were to happen.

In conclusion, this paper has discussed the use of surveillance cameras in three targeted areas of central Stockholm. While it can be concluded that an increasing amount of surveillance cameras and a higher quality picture would raise concern and lessen the feeling of safety and access to the city, the use of cameras today is overall not seen as a concern. The cameras might affect the right to the city for young women, as well as decreasing their feeling of integrity at the same time, if the use of surveillance cameras is expanded. However, a majority of the women participating in the focus groups are indifferent towards the cameras and feel like the cameras do not affect them in their day-to-day life. Further research could therefore study a larger group of women, in order to get a generalizable answer regarding if the cameras change their pattern of movement, feeling of safety and sense of right to the city. This could be combined with a quantitative study of statistics regarding solved criminal investigations that has used surveillance camera videos as evidence, in order to discuss and motivate either an expanded or decreased use of them in public spaces. Studies regarding this could also investigate how the right to the city is affected by how women perceive the cameras, but in an generalizable context, something that this paper can not provide.

## 9. References

Allen, M. (2017). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*. Vols. 1-4. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc

Angrosino, M. (2007). *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Anrell, O. (2018). Nu sitter poliskameror även på Sergels torg. *Mitt i Vasastan* (Online)  
<https://www.mitti.se/nyheter/nu-sitter-poliskameror-aven-pa-sergels-torg/lmrhx!4278309/>  
[Accessed 2021-12-03]

Barrie, S. (2011). Camera surveillance within the UK: Enhancing public safety or a social threat?, *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 25:1, 193–203

Beebeejaun, Y. (2017). Gender, urban space, and the right to everyday life, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 39:3, 323-334  
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07352166.2016.1255526>

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., & Robson K. (2001). *Focus Groups in Social Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Brottsförebyggande rådet. (2021). “Nationella trygghetsundersökningen”. (Online)  
<https://www.bra.se/statistik/statistiska-undersokningar/nationella-trygghetsundersokningen.html>  
[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. 5th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Constitution Annotated. (N.A.) The Fourth Amendment, The Constitution of the United States  
<https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-4/>

Ellis, C., Adams, T.E., & Bochner, A.P. (2011). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 36:4(138), 273–290.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23032294>

Fridberg, H. (2017). Nordic Sustainable Cities: a key to global urbanization challenges, *Nordregio News*, no. 4, 6-8



<https://nordregio.org/nordregio-magazine/issues/connecting-the-urban-and-the-rural/nordic-sustainable-cities-a-key-to-global-urbanization-challenges/>

Grinneby, D. (2021). "Is it safe out there? Women feeling safe in Stockholm, a mixed-method approach to the experience of safety in the city". Course paper; SGEA23:4, VT21. Lunds University

Harvey, D. (2008). The Right to the City. *New Left Review*. No. 53. 23-40. (Online)  
<https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii53/articles/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city>  
[Accessed 2021-12-02]

Jernhusen (N.A). Centralstaden Stockholm länkar ihop staden.  
<https://www.jernhusen.se/stationsnara-stadsutveckling/vara-stadsutvecklingsprojekt/stockholm/>  
[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Kopicki, A. (2014). Women and the 'I Don't Know' Problem, *The New York Times* (Online)  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/16/upshot/women-and-the-i-dont-know-problem.html>  
[Accessed 2021-12-15]

Koskela, H. (2000). 'The gaze without eyes': video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space, *Progress in Human Geography*, 24:2, 243-265

Lefebvre, H. (1967). The right to the City. In Kofman, E. & Lebas E. (Eds.). (1996). *Writing on cities*. London: Blackwell. p. 146-161

Liamputtong, P. (2011). *Focus Group Methodology: Principles and Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Majlard, J. (2019). 100 miljoner till livekameror i tunnelbanan, *Svenska Dagbladet*. (Online)  
<https://www.svd.se/samtliga-vagnar-i-t-banan-ska-liveovervakas>  
[Accessed 2021-11-30]

MSB. (2017). Utvärdering av hantering av attentatet i Stockholm 7 april 2017. MSB. (Online)  
<https://www.msb.se/RibData/Filer/pdf/28471.pdf>  
[Accessed 2021-12-23]

National Police Chief's Council. (N.A.) Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR). (Online)  
<https://www.npcc.police.uk/FreedomofInformation/ANPR.aspx>  
[Accessed 2021-11-15]

Nelson, L. & Seager, J. (2005). *A companion to feminist geography*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Omni. (2018). Nya kameror till T-banan- kan direktsända händelser. *Svenska Dagbladet*. (Online)

<https://www.svd.se/nya-kameror-pa-tunnelbanan--kan-direktsanda-handelser>  
[Accessed 2021-11-30]

Orwell, G. (1949). *1984*. London: Secker & Warbug

Paessler. (2021). IT Explained: CCTV. Paessler The Monitoring Experts (Online).

<https://www.paessler.com/it-explained/cctv>  
[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Piza, E. L., Welsh, B.C., Farrington D.P., & Thomas, A.L. (2018). CCTV and Crime Prevention -A new Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Brottsförebyggande rådet*. (Online)

[https://bra.se/download/18.c4ecee2162e20d258c421a8/1530605772865/2018\\_CCTV\\_and\\_Crime\\_Prevention.pdf](https://bra.se/download/18.c4ecee2162e20d258c421a8/1530605772865/2018_CCTV_and_Crime_Prevention.pdf)  
[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Polismyndigheten. (2021). Kameraövervakning. *Polisen.se*. (Online)

<https://polisen.se/lagar-och-regler/behandling-av-personuppgifter/kamerabevakning/>  
[Accessed 2021-11-30]

Satariano, A. (2019). Real-Time Surveillance Will Test the British Tolerance for Cameras. *The New York Times*. (Online)

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/15/technology/britain-surveillance-privacy.html>  
[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Slobogin, C. (2002). Public Privacy: Camera Surveillance of Public Places and the Right to Anonymity, *Mississippi Law Journal*, 72:1, 213-316 [https://heinonline-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/mislj72&id=223&men\\_tab=srchresults](https://heinonline-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/mislj72&id=223&men_tab=srchresults)

Stoeffel, K. (2014). Why It's Great That Women Say 'I Don't Know'. *The Cut*. (Online)

<https://www.thecut.com/2014/05/why-its-great-that-women-say-i-dont-know.html>  
[Accessed 2021-12-15]

Symanovich, S. (2020). What is facial recognition? How facial recognition works. Norton. (Online)

<https://us.norton.com/internetsecurity-iot-how-facial-recognition-software-works.html>

[Accessed 2021-12-22]

Tollin, K., Hammar, L. & Jonsson, A. (2021). Narkotikamarknaden- En studie av smuggling, gatuförsäljning, internethandel och köpare. Brottsförebyggande rådet. (Online)

[https://bra.se/download/18.1f8c9903175f8b2aa70f67b/1631001260503/2021\\_10\\_Narkotika\\_marknader.pdf](https://bra.se/download/18.1f8c9903175f8b2aa70f67b/1631001260503/2021_10_Narkotika_marknader.pdf)

[Accessed 2021-12-20]

Turner, L. (2019). Manhunt: The real-life story of behind the ITV drama. *BBC*. (Online)

<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-46787240>

[Accessed 2021-12-03]

Vackert väder. (2021). Soluppgång och solnedgång för Stockholm. Vackertväder.se. (Online)

<https://www.vackertvader.se/stockholm/soluppgång-och-solnedgång>

[Accessed 2021-12-23]

Zavattaro, S. (2019). *Using feminist geography to understand feelings of safety and neighborhood*. University of Florida. (Online)

<https://eds-b-ebsohost-com.ludwig.lub.lu.se/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=7b77558a-2d6c-4952-af61-857a4c133cf0%40sessionmgr101>

[Accessed 2021-11-12]