

SIDE and Closed Circuit Television (CCTV): Exploring Surveillance in Public Space

Since Reicher's (1984) pioneering work on a social identity approach to deindividuation, a body of research has grown up around what has become known as the SIDE model (Spears & Lea 1994; Reicher, Spears & Postmes 1995). SIDE has taken the old assumptions of deindividuation (that under conditions of high visual anonymity people become less self regulated and thus more likely to commit anti-social acts) and has raised questions about the nature of that visibility. In particular SIDE theorists have pointed out that identity relations are central to questions of both visibility and accountability (Spears, Lea & Lee 1990; Reicher, Spears & Postmes 1995; Reicher & Levine 1994). By manipulating visibility/anonymity of self to others and of others to self (and also social category information about ingroup and outgroup status) an impressive body of evidence has begun to emerge (Postmes & Spears 1998).

Several organising (and interrelated) themes can be detected in this work. For example, one way to view the literature is by focusing on different SIDE research domains. One strand of SIDE work has taken advantage of 'new technologies' like computer mediated communication (CMC) as a useful medium for exploring identity relations under deindividuation conditions (eg. Spears, Lea & Lea 1990; Spears & Lea 1994; Postmes, Spears & Lea 1998). A second SIDE research strand traces a lineage more directly to traditional work on crowd psychology (Reicher 1984; Reicher & Levine 1994 a, 1994b; Reicher, Levine & Gordijn 1998) and is concerned more transparently with power and resistance in an intergroup setting. An alternative way to organise the literature is through a concern with the cognitive and the strategic aspects of identity in relation to visibility/anonymity under deindividuation conditions. This maps (in part) onto a third possible organising principle. Namely a concern with visibility to the ingroup and visibility to the outgroup. To simplify enormously, two complimentary research trajectories might be identified. The first incorporates a CMC milieu, an interest in the cognitive aspects of identity and a focus on the question of visibility to the ingroup. The second incorporates a crowd psychology milieu, an interest in the strategic aspects of identity and a focus on the question of visibility to the outgroup. Of course, none of these distinctions can be made to hold still for very long. As the research paradigm has progressed, so researchers are looking not only at the interactions of the cognitive and the strategic, but also at visibility to ingroup and outgroup at one and the same time.

The aim of this chapter is not simply to contribute to some of the discussions and disputes which have emerged (inevitably) as papers exploring different aspects of SIDE are published. Instead, I want to turn the gaze of SIDE outwards, confident that the body of knowledge attached to SIDE phenomena has a stable core. I want to try and take SIDE out of the laboratory and explore the contributions that the insights generated by a SIDE perspective can make to other important social issues. In particular, I want to look at a development in British social life which has become almost ubiquitous and which raises, in a thoroughly practical way, many of the questions which lie at the heart of the SIDE paradigm. This development is the increasing surveillance of public space in Britain by close circuit television surveillance systems (CCTV).

There are two principal reasons why CCTV provides an exemplary domain for exploring the insights drawn from a SIDE perspective. The first is that CCTV systems have been established to make certain places and populations visible. CCTV aims to deny 'criminals' the comfort of anonymity and to render people accountable for their behaviour. These objectives invoke concepts familiar to both traditional and SIDE deindividuation theorists. SIDE can help us explore the assumptions behind CCTV installations and give us an insight into some of the intended (and unintended) consequences of such forms of surveillance. The second reason for utilising SIDE to consider CCTV is that (as will be documented below) CCTV has now penetrated deeply into the fabric of social life in Britain. At the same time however, there has been very little discussion about the implications of such technology. Attempts to raise issues about evaluation of CCTV have generally been slapped down by suggesting that those interested in opening up debate may have something to hide. Where research has been carried out it has tended to concentrate on whether CCTV technology works in its own terms — ie. whether crimes are reduced (or displaced) or whether arrests have increased (or whether new forms of arrestable behaviour emerge). There is (as yet) no research programme which addresses the psychological implications of the transformation of public space through constant visual surveillance. The SIDE tradition provides us with the basis for such a programme by suggesting the kinds of questions which should be asked of the surveillers and the surveilled.

What is CCTV?

Before I begin to explore what a SIDE analysis of CCTV might look like, it would be helpful to clarify what CCTV actually is. As has already been said, closed circuit television surveillance systems (CCTV) have become a common feature of Britain's streetscapes. High quality colour video cameras (with pan, tilt and zoom facilities) are now a common sight suspended above (and monitoring) the public spaces of most British towns and cities. The pictures generated by these cameras are all networked and relayed back to a central viewing location (usually in a police station — although the cameras are not normally being monitored by police personnel but by private security company or local council staff). Since the first of these integrated network of surveillance cameras was installed in the British seaside town of Bournemouth in 1985, the number of CCTV schemes has grown dramatically. Over the last 15 years

almost all major towns and cities in the British Isles have established CCTV facilities. Between 150 and 300 million pounds per year is spent on the surveillance industry involving between 200, 000 and 400,00 cameras. The growth of the surveillance sector is estimated at 15 to 20% annually (Davies 1998). The British Home Office estimates that 95% of towns and cities are moving to install CCTV surveillance of public areas, housing estates, car parks and other public facilities (Davies 1996). When you add road and motorway cameras, private security cameras, CCTV in shopping malls and centres it becomes easy to see that we are reaching a situation where a person can be under surveillance for the entire time they are outside the house. It is not surprising therefore that Graham and Marvin (1996) can argue that Britain now has more public space CCTV schemes than any other advanced capitalist nation.

CCTV and the traditional deindividuation model

A full analysis of the penetration of CCTV into the social fabric of Britain would involve unpacking a complex and multifaceted network of connections. One part of this network can be traced back to political and economic changes which began in the early 1980's. CCTV emerged as a response to some of the unrest provoked by the 'Thatcherisation' of Britain and was seen by successive governments as a technological quick fix for a host of crime related social and economic problems. Another part of the growth of CCTV can be traced to the way financial inducements were offered to local councils to install such systems. Central government offered huge sums of money to establish CCTV schemes while cutting back other budgets. Councils began to apply for money to establish such schemes without having identified a need, simply to increase their incomes. At the same time, the last Conservative government removed the need for planning permission for CCTV installations (or indeed any form of regulation for such systems) making CCTV easier to establish. The private sector have also had a role to play in CCTV proliferation, with insurance companies offering discounts on premiums to those with CCTV systems in place. Taken together, it is clear that government, public and private sector institutions came to see CCTV as a technological 'magic bullet' for the control of crime and the maintenance of public order.

One of the themes to emerge from even this cursory analysis of the proliferation of CCTV technology is the apparent transformation in the ethos which underpins public policy on crime and public order. Alongside the spread of CCTV systems there seems to have been a shift in the language of social control. Public policy seems to have moved away from trying to understand (and thus be able to change) the social conditions which lead to crime. In its place has come a concern with managing people's behaviour. This shift in emphasis is captured nicely by former British Prime Minister John Major's injunction to 'condemn a little more, understand a little less'. Making public spaces visible through the medium of CCTV has been central to this change. At the heart of this new approach is the idea that if people are rendered visible they can be made accountable. At the same time there is the implicit assumption that if people are not watched, they are more likely to engage in anti-social activities.

Both of these assumptions are also present in traditional deindividuation literatures. It would be easy to take one of the core assumptions of traditional deindividuation work — that under conditions of anonymity behaviour becomes less regulated by the self and thus more likely to be anti-social — and place it at the heart of a CCTV inspired public order policy. In these terms, surveillance can only serve the public good. Any opposition to CCTV can be presented as giving licence to unregulated and anti-social activities.

CCTV, SIDE and surveillance

It is at this point that the strength of a SIDE approach to CCTV becomes apparent. The SIDE critique of traditional deindividuation research argues convincingly that behaviour is not unregulated under conditions of anonymity. The SIDE model points out that people act (under deindividuation like conditions) in terms of the salience and contents of social identities. Moreover, SIDE shows that issues of salience and content of identity are relational. In other words, in SIDE research on the impact of visibility/invisibility on behaviour, the key question has always been ‘visibility/invisibility to whom?’.

When this kind of question is asked of CCTV it becomes apparent that the traditional understanding of the effects of surveillance might be rather limited. For example, rather than seeing the effects of CCTV in terms of a simple dichotomy (the surveillance or lack of surveillance of public space) — and assuming that this dichotomy maps onto conduct (regulated versus unregulated behaviour) — the effects of surveillance become more complicated. It becomes important to know whether people realise they are being monitored; whether they feel they (as opposed to others) are being watched; who they think might be watching them (ingroup members/outgroup members?); what kinds of behaviours are acceptable to or punishable by whoever is watching and so on. It would also be important to explore the conditions under which people become aware of the surveillance. Does surveillance make people feel more individuated or does it raise the salience of a collective identity? Perhaps a better question would examine the conditions under which individuation or collective identification were likely to occur.

These are just a few of the questions that begin to emerge as a SIDE perspective on CCTV develops. They are by no means an exhaustive set. At this early stage in the exposure of CCTV to SIDE theory, the generation of questions is as important as the way we go about trying to provide answers. Thus, for the remainder of the chapter I will not attempt to work through a detailed research programme (there will be time enough to make use of the rigours of experimentation to explore particular aspects of the SIDE/CCTV relationship). I propose instead to explore three general areas where it seems to me that questions asked of both CCTV and SIDE theory might provoke answers that would illuminate both. These three areas include surveillance and inter-group relations; surveillance and kinds of visibility; and surveillance, power and resistance. In exploring these areas I will try to raise not only the questions that a SIDE perspective suggests are important for CCTV but also the issues that the literature on CCTV raises for SIDE theory.

CCTV surveillance and intergroup relations.

As we have already seen, proponents of CCTV tend to have a narrow vision of the impact of CCTV on crime and disorder. Surveillance is seen as having a reasonably undifferentiated effect — people are divided into those who have something to hide and those who do not. CCTV proponents hope to make public space 'safe' for the former at the expense of the latter. A SIDE perspective requires us to open out the examination of surveillance in a more intergroup frame. Rather than assuming a clear and straightforward relationship between surveiller and surveilled, SIDE asks about the salience of particular identities; the relations of power between the surveiller and the surveilled, and the question of visibility to ingroup and outgroup members.

These concerns are echoed in the work of social theorists, sociologists and social geographers who also explore the impact of CCTV on public space in Britain. A body of work is beginning to emerge which argues that CCTV, despite an egalitarian rhetoric, is being used for the 'moral regulation' of city centres (Bianchini 1990). Such moral regulation involves the 'purification' of public space (Bannister, Fyfe & Kearns 1998) by removing groups of people who are seen to be 'out of place'. These include groups of young people (particularly men), public drinkers, beggars, vagrants, the homeless and so on. In their observational study of CCTV control rooms, Norris and Armstrong (1997, p. 85 — quoted in McCahill 1998) found that 'nine out of ten target surveillances were on men, particularly if they were young and black', and that 'targeting of the homeless, the vagrant and the alcoholic... was a regular feature' of surveillance in most control rooms. For the most part this targeting was not as a result of troublesome behaviour or criminal activity, but because of their perceived capacity to disrupt the city centre atmosphere for others. It is no coincidence that the groups who are the principle focus of CCTV gaze are those who tend to conform least well to the moral codes of well ordered consumption (Bianchini 1990).

One consequence of this targeting of these groups has been the increasing homogenisation of town and city centres. Any form of 'difference' (Sibley 1995, Sennett 1996) is being policed to the periphery of town centres — usually back to working class housing estates — where CCTV is gradually beginning to penetrate also. This form of policing of public space (with its eradication of difference in the pursuit of a 'comfortable' shopping environment) has provoked alarm from some quarters. Sennett (1996) for example, claims that heterogeneity (and its attendant but minor disorder and confusion) is crucial to the maintenance of healthy urban communities. For Sennett and others (see also Christopherson 1994 and Sibley 1995), attempts to eradicate difference and danger in town centres can have perverse consequences. Rather than making people feel safer (and therefore more likely to use public spaces) it can make them feel even more threatened. If the streets are not places that encourage encounters between people of different classes, cultures, ideologies etc, then they become sites of increased fear of marginal groups.

Given that CCTV is central to the strategy of 'purification' of public space (and thus the attendant concerns over the consequences of the elimination of difference) it is important to explore the psychological consequences of CCTV surveillance. As we have seen, SIDE theory offers a way to explore the psychological basis of claims and

counter claims for the consequences of CCTV surveillance. In other words, it allows an opening for a psychology of surveillance. The evidence we have seen thus far suggests that CCTV might be having differential effects on those who are potential targets of surveillance and those who are not. For those who are targeted, it would be important to discover whether they felt this was the case; who they thought was watching them; what power the watchers had over them; how being a target for surveillance affected their relationships with others (both ingroup and outgroup) in public space and so on. For those that might not be seen as targets (the 'ordinary', white, middle class, family, consumer) it would be important to know whether they felt they were being watched (or whether the watching was being done on their behalf); what the conditions under which they move from being inconspicuous to being targeted might be; and how the conditions of public surveillance affects their relationships to others (both potential 'ingroup' as well as marginal 'outgroup' members) in public space.

This focus on the differential impact of surveillance on different social groups should also be seen in the context of two interrelated and practical problems of British urban life. The first is the apparent paradox that although CCTV surveilled public spaces are deemed to be safer than ever, people report greater levels of fear of crime and use public spaces less. The second is a concern with the likelihood of receiving help from others in public places. It may be that the very fact that some public spaces are surveilled that leads people to believe that these are dangerous places. It may also be that having cameras to monitor public space means that people feel less and less directly responsible for the welfare of others in these spaces. Questions such as these (although familiar to those who work in public policy on crime and disorder) imply a psychological dimension which has yet to be fully explored. The promise of a SIDE approach to CCTV surveillance is that these kinds of questions can be illuminated by a new set of psychological theories and techniques.

CCTV surveillance and kinds of visibility

A second way in which the bringing together of SIDE and CCTV might produce new insights is by comparing and contrasting concepts of visibility in SIDE and CCTV literatures. SIDE theorists are already sensitive to distinctions that can be made between being anonymous and being (in)visible; or being visible and being accountable; or being physically or virtually co-present. However, SIDE theorists are less clear about the mechanisms by which these different forms of (in)visibility of self to others and others to self produce cognitive and strategic effects on behaviour. The question of how we can tease apart the effects of different forms of visibility is one which has begun to challenge SIDE researchers. It is here that an examination of the way visibility is conceptualised in a CCTV context might be helpful for SIDE work on these issues.

The visibility implied by CCTV technology is clearly different from the visibility of interpersonal or intergroup contact. When people can see each other (in an unmediated way) there are certain rules which govern looking (cf. Goffman 1972). These rules, which include keeping the gaze relatively unfixed, not staring and looking away if the gaze is met, are predicated on an equality of exchange. By and large,

when people encounter each other on the street, they have the means to respond to the gaze should it fall upon them. They can stare back, look away or challenge the person doing the looking. They can read the gaze in different ways, and through a number of interactional devices, explore the veracity of those readings.

By contrast, the introduction of cameras into Town Centres fundamentally alters the relationship between the watcher and the watched. Those who are watching the pictures from the cameras share the same time with those who are watched — but not the same physical space. The relationship is, to use Giddens (1990) term, 'distanciated'. The cameras also potentially alter the relationship between those who are co-present. Those whose gaze is unmediated are themselves being watched by the camera operatives from a control room some distance away. The consequences of this distanciation are important. The mediated gaze of the CCTV camera means that there is an asymmetrical relationship between watcher and watched. It is not possible to tell, even if you look up at a CCTV camera from the street, whether the camera is looking at you. This uncertainty will have consequences for how you act. Even when you are being watched, you cannot look back and read the intentions of the watcher through the veil of the camera lens. There is no reciprocal exchange of visual data. This means that the possibility of directly challenging the gaze is also lost. Finally, the gaze of the TV camera has several temporal features that are not present in other interactions. For example the camera does not blink or look away and it keeps a constant record of what it sees.

This brief examination of CCTV visibility suggests three important issues for SIDE research. The first is the question of mediated as opposed to unmediated surveillance. The differences are apparent in a CCTV context and might usefully be unpacked in current SIDE research. For example, it would be interesting to explore the effect of technologies and the way they affect the responses to visibility in SIDE experiments. The second concerns asymmetries of power and visibility. To what extent does the ability to look back, contextualise or resist surveillance shape perceptions of visibility to others? The third issue concerns the importance of time and space in thinking about visibility. The spatial and temporal relationships between surveiller and surveilled are clearly an integral part of the complex effects of visibility. These are as yet unexplored in SIDE research.

CCTV surveillance, power and resistance

A third area in which the bringing together of SIDE and CCTV can produce mutually beneficial insights is through an examination of the relationship between visibility, power and resistance. The ways in which power operates is something which interests both SIDE theorists and critics of CCTV. Both are concerned not only with the operation of power on the less powerful, but also on the ways in which power can be resisted. For example, there is SIDE research that shows that when less powerful groups are made visible to powerful groups, compliance with and resistance to the powerful is dependent (in part) on visibility to the ingroup (Reicher & Levine 1994 a,b; Reicher, Levine & Gordijn 1998). Reicher and colleagues used the relations of

power between staff and students in a university setting to explore this phenomena. They asked students about behaviours that were directly punishable by staff (eg missing seminars, fiddling data for practical reports) and about behaviours that were not directly punishable by staff, but which might attract disapproval (eg excessive drinking, telling sexist jokes). They found that when students were identifiable to the staff and visible to each other they tended to downplay the degree of directly punishable behaviours they might engage in, but to exaggerate the degree of disapproved (but unpunishable) behaviours. It seems from this that, in the face of the power of an out-group, there is a strategic compromise between avoiding direct confrontation on things that are clearly punishable by the powerful, and enhancing behaviour that falls short of punishability but can still be read as resistance.

There are similar concerns about visibility, power and resistance in the CCTV literature. However, before exploring the relationship between this literature and SIDE theory, it is worth saying a few words about the notion of power inherent in CCTV technology. A number of theorists (Marx 1988; Lyon 1994) have argued that it would be a mistake to see the power of CCTV surveillance as being divorced from the social relations in which it has developed. The forms of surveillance afforded by technology such as CCTV are not, by definition, dangerous. Rather, as Lyon (1994, p214) points out, there is a Janus like quality to the electronic eye, whose surveillance implies 'control and care, proscription and protection'. CCTV cameras can facilitate intervention in crimes that might otherwise have led to serious injury or death — but also infringe the civil liberties of those who are targeted for no reason. This dilemmatic quality is recognised even by those people who would seem to be the targets of CCTV surveillance. For example, Short and Ditton (1998), in a study of the attitudes to CCTV of Scottish ex-convicts, found that their respondents felt that CCTV was as likely to save them from a beating in the town centre as it was to catch them performing an illegal act. It is precisely this dilemmatic quality which is at the heart of the power of CCTV surveillance.

With the dilemmatic qualities of CCTV surveillance in mind, let us turn to what a SIDE perspective can offer studies of resistance to CCTV technology. It might seem at first sight that there is little scope for researching resistance to CCTV. For example, local newspapers and local councils who have conducted surveys report public support for CCTV running at more than 90%. Moreover, there seems to have been very little public dissension at the spread of CCTV installations. However, as Ditton, Short, Phillips, Norris and Armstrong (1999) point out, in surveys which have been conducted by academics and independent polling organisations, the picture is more complicated. Firstly, the percentage of people who say they are happy with the presence of CCTV tends to drop to about 65% in these more independent surveys. There is also variability in degree of contentment with CCTV depending on who believed to be viewing the CCTV footage. More than half the respondents to surveys by Honess and Charman (1992) and by Ditton et al (1999) agreed with the proposition that CCTV footage could be viewed by the wrong people (although who these people were was not specified). In addition, even amongst the two thirds of people who are in favour of CCTV, there was a strong degree of support for the proposition that CCTV could undermine civil liberties. In the most recent review, Ditton et al (1999) suggest that

up to a third of the population (a substantial minority) have misgivings about the spread of CCTV.

In fact Davies (1996, 1998) has begun to argue that public support for CCTV is in decline. He offers evidence of the emergence of organised protests against CCTV installations. In the vanguard of such protests are groups who have had experience of blanket and intrusive surveillance by the state in the course of road or environmental protests.¹ These include groups like Earth First! Davies gives examples from an Earth First! organised protest in Brighton, a town on the South Coast of England. He describes actions which involve attempts to undermine the confidence of the relationship between the CCTV camera operators and the police on the ground. These include groups of activists pretending to set cars on fire under the surveillance of CCTV cameras by pouring liquid out of petrol cans. When the police arrive it becomes clear that the liquid is in fact water. Other actions include pretending to roll and then smoke large marijuana joints under the eye of the camera. The joints turn out to include nothing but tobacco.

Actions which might constitute protests over being surveilled by cameras are not confined to organised groups. In my own discussions with CCTV operators in Lancaster it seems that less organised acts of engagement with the cameras are reasonably common. CCTV operatives describe the practice amongst some men of waving to the cameras and then 'mooning' (turning round and dropping their trousers to reveal their behind!) as a regular phenomenon (particularly after a few drinks). They also report that women have been known to engage in similar kinds of activity, either 'mooning' or raising their tops. This kind of behaviour can simply be read as alcohol fuelled high spirits. However it seems also to reveal a relationship with the cameras that implies resistance. These kinds of minor transgressions are unlikely to lead to arrests as the camera operators are on the lookout for more serious acts of disorder. However, the fact that people seek out the cameras in order to engage in such behaviour (which is likely to go unpunished) suggests a delight in mocking the power of the all seeing eye.

A SIDE analysis this kind of behaviour might allow the disentangling of the relationships between surveillance, power and resistance to CCTV. The behaviour of groups and individuals in the examples above suggests a complex relationship with the visibility afforded by the CCTV cameras. It is clearly not the case that visibility to the camera simply produces compliance. There seems to be a set of assumptions about who might be watching, what kinds of powers they have and can enforce; and a playing with the boundaries of punishment. In practice it seems as if there is a degree of strategic communication between the surveilled and the surveillor. This fits well with the experimental work in a SIDE tradition which demonstrates strategic presentation of self under conditions of visibility to both ingroup and outgroup (- if we take the dropping of trousers to be the functional equivalent of students saying that they drink ten pints a night while telling a continuous stream of sexist jokes!). It seems from this that the study of compliance with and resistance to CCTV affords a

¹ The videoing of road and environmental protests by the police is now standard practice. Police video units record demonstrators as a matter of routine and in the absence of any offence being committed.

practical domain in which to explore important issues in SIDE theory and research. All that remains is for the apparent parallels between SIDE experimental work and the accounts of behaviour under CCTV surveillance to be brought together in an empirical frame.

Conclusions

The aim of this chapter has been to explore some of the insights that might follow from an exchange of ideas between SIDE theory and the growing literature on CCTV surveillance. I have argued that a focus on CCTV could take SIDE out of the laboratory and into debates in an important public arena. SIDE provides a credible theoretical framework for exploring the impact of CCTV surveillance on people in public space. At the same time, in the course of developing an analysis of CCTV, new insights and questions (which might be taken back into the laboratory) emerge for SIDE theory. I have suggested in this paper that there are at least three substantive areas where SIDE and CCTV share mutual concerns. These include the intergroup dynamics of visibility; concepts of visibility itself; and the relationship between power and resistance. I have made some tentative suggestions about what might be worth developing in each of these areas

In conclusion I want to suggest that the benefits of bringing together SIDE and CCTV might extend to thinking about key theoretical concepts in Social Identity work in general. I have already mentioned (in passing) the relevance of concepts like time and space for studies of CCTV visibility. Attempts to develop research on these questions would need to address the temporal assumptions of work in a social identity and self categorisation tradition (see Condor 1996). Such work would also need to address how spatiality is currently conceptualised in traditional social psychological research (see Dixon 1999 on spatiality and contact). Dealing with time and space in this way is bound to enrich both social identity and self categorisation theories.

In similar fashion, theoretical insights might also emerge from a juxtaposition of concepts which appear in both CCTV and SIDE literatures, but which are attributed with different qualities. For example, critics of the way CCTV is used to target certain social groups argue that the resultant 'homogeneity' is a bad thing for groups in public space. In these terms 'homogeneity' is seen to undermine the importance of the engagement with diversity, difference and risk which is necessary for a healthy society. At the same time, 'homogeneity' is important to SIDE research in a different way. It is a key concept in work on the salience of identity. When a particular identity is salient, homogeneity (along with ideas like interchangeability) is seen as central to the successful functioning of a group. Further exploration of this different emphasis on the uses and utility of concepts like homogeneity may help to enrich theoretical work on identity in general.

Finally there is the question of the relationship between visibility and power. In the CCTV literature the relationships are complex. Power does not simply reside in the hands of a particular person or group who then impose it on another group. The transformations of public space which result from constant visual surveillance, combined

with the dilemmatic qualities of that surveillance, produce complex effects. Power becomes vested not in the surveillance by a particular person (like a police officer) but in the electronic eye of the camera. This induces a 'state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power' (Foucault 1977, 201). This kind of power is of a different order to the more unidimensional form that is usually deployed in identity work. Addressing the multiple forms of power and visibility in the CCTV literature may have the added benefit of enriching concepts of power in the identity literature as a whole.

References

- Bannister, J., Fyfe, N. & Kearns, A. (1998). Closed circuit television and the city. In C. Norris, J. Moran and G. Armstrong (Eds), *Surveillance, Closed Circuit tv and Social Control*. Ashgate: Aldershot
- Bianchini, F. (1990). The crisis of urban public social life in Britain: Origins of the problem and possible responses. *Planning, Policy and Research*, 5, 476-485
- Condor, S. (1996). Social Identity and Time. In W.P. Robinson (ed.), *Social Groups and Identities. Developing the Legacy of Henri Tajfel*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinmann
- Christopherson, S. (1994). The Fortress City: privatised spaces, consumer citizenship, In A. Armin (ed), *Post Fordism: A Reader*. Blackwell: Oxford pp 409-427
- Davies, S. (1996). *Big Brother: Britain's web of surveillance and the new technological order*. London: Pan Books
- Davies, S. (1998). CCTV: a new battleground for privacy. In C. Norris, J. Moran & G. Armstrong (Eds), *Surveillance, Closed Circuit tv and Social Control*. Ashgate: Aldershot
- Ditton, J., Short, E., Phillips, S., Norris, C. & Armstrong, G. (1999). *The Effect of Closed Circuit Television on Recorded Crime Rates and Public Concern about Crime in Glasgow*, The Scottish Office Research Unit: Edinburgh
- Dixon, J. (1999). *Contact and Boundaries: 'locating' the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Unpublished manuscript. Lancaster University
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, Allen Lane: London
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press: Cambridge
- Goffman, E. (1972). *Behaviour in Public Places*. Pelican: Harmondsworth
- Graham, S & Marvin, S. (1996). *Telecommunications and the City: electronic spaces, urban places*. Routledge: London
- Honess, T. & Charman, E. (1992). *Closed Circuit Television in public places*. Crime Prevention Unit paper no. 25, HMSO: London
- Lyon, D. (1994). *The Electronic Eye: the rise of surveillance society*. Polity press: Cambridge
- Marx, G. T. (1988). *Undercover: police surveillance in America*, University of California Press: California
- McCahill, M. (1998). Beyond Foucault: towards a contemporary theory of surveillance. In C. Norris, J. Moran & G. Armstrong (Eds), *Surveillance, Closed Circuit tv and Social Control*. Ashgate: Aldershot
- Postmes, T., Spears, R. & Lea, M. (1998). Breaching or building social boundaries? SIDE-effects of computer-mediated communication. *Communication Research*, 25, 689-715
- Postmes, T. & Spears, R. (1998). Deindividuation and antinormative behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123, 238-259
- Reicher, S. (1984). Social influence in the crowd: Attitudinal and behavioural effects of deindividuation in conditions of high and low group salience. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 341-350
- Reicher, S. & Levine, M. (1994a). Deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: The effects of visibility to the outgroup. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 145-163
- Reicher, S & Levine, M. (1994b). On the consequences of deindividuation manipulations for the strategic communication of the self: identifiability and the presentation of social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 511-524
- Reicher, S., Spears, S. & Postmes, T. (1995). A social identity model of deindividuation phenomena. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 6, 161 -198.

- Reicher, S., Levine, R.M & Gordijn, E. (1998). More on deindividuation, power relations between groups and the expression of social identity: three studies on the effect of visibility to the ingroup. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 15-40
- Sennett, R. (1996). *The Uses of Disorder: personal identity and city life*. Faber and Faber: London
- Short, E & Ditton, J (1998). Seen and Now Heard: talking to targets of open street CCTV, *British Journal of Criminology*, 38, 404-428
- Sibley, D (1995). *Geographies of Exclusion: society and difference in the West*. Routledge: London
- Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1994). Panacea or panopticon? The hidden power in computer mediated communication. *Communication Research*, 21, 427-459
- Spears, R., Lea, M., & Lee, S. (1990). De-individuation and group polarization in computer-mediated communication. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 121-134.

Correspondence should be addressed to: Mark Levine, Departement of Psychology, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YF, UK. E-mail: m.levine@lancaster.ac.uk