Globalization of Personal Data Project – International Survey

Findings from the Chicago Pre-Survey Focus Groups

Submitted to:

Professor Elia Zurek

Department of Sociology

Queen's University

July 2004

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

Building on the focus groups undertaken in May 2004, EKOS Research Associates was hired by Queen's University to conduct two additional focus groups in Chicago in support of the Globalization of Personal Data (GPD) Project.

The objectives of the American pre-survey focus groups were to provide the research team with additional insight on the issues and how they are perceived from an American perspective, with a view to helping frame the questions for the actual survey.

It should be borne in mind when reading this report that these findings are drawn exclusively from qualitative research (and only two focus groups in total). While every effort is made to balance various demographic characteristics when recruiting participants, these groups (and therefore the findings drawn from them) may not be said to be representative of the larger population as a whole.

2.0 Research Methodology

The research findings are based on the following:

- In total, two focus groups were conducted in Chicago on July 8th, 2004.
- The first focus group was held with workers and travellers, and the second with consumers and members from the general public.[1]
- The groups lasted approximately two hours and were held in a dedicated facility to allow for audio and videotaping.
- A total of 14 individuals were recruited for each of the focus groups. In total, the focus groups involved the participation of 20 individuals.
- All participants received a cash incentive for their involvement.
- The moderator's guide used in the first series of focus groups was modified slightly to reflect the fact that the groups were taking place in the United States. The guide is attached in Appendix A.

[1] The recruitment was virtually identical to the first round of focus groups. Unlike the first round, the workers and travellers were combined into one group. Likewise, the group with consumers and the general public were combined into one group.

3.0 Key Findings

As mentioned, the findings are based on only two focus groups. Within this context, there is less ability to draw the strong conclusions that could be made if a larger number of focus groups had been undertaken. That being said, the focus groups pointed to many findings that mirrored what was observed in the focus groups already undertaken in Toronto and Montreal. At the same time, however, there were also notable differences when compared to the Canadian focus groups. Given that the first report outlined the findings from Toronto and Montreal in relative depth, this report places more emphasis on the differences in attitudes that were observed between the Canadian and American focus groups.

Similar to the Canadian focus groups, the findings from the Chicago focus groups pointed to a number of over-arching themes that were relatively consistent across all participants. Likewise, the same conclusion that attitudes in relation to privacy are both complex and extremely context-driven applied equally to the Chicago participants.

Perceptions and Experiences with Privacy Issues

The extent to which the top-of-mind imagery of "privacy" and "security" in the Chicago focus groups mirrored the Canadian groups was staggering, although some differences became apparent.

Again, top-of-mind imagery reinforces the fact that both privacy and security mean different things to different people.

- In relation to privacy, participants pointed to a number of the same top-of-mind images, ranging from broad concepts such as confidentiality, secrecy and things that are more subtle and personal, to laws/legislation, to the increasing lack of privacy to being left alone (e.g., "nobody's business"). Reflecting the same diversity and similarity of responses, two participants even pointed to the original surprising imagery of "bathroom" (as was given in one of the Toronto focus groups). Where the imagery tended to differ from the Canadian groups was the larger number Chicago participants who emphasized imagery related to "rights" (e.g., civil rights, privacy as a right, the U.S. Constitution).

- Like the Canadian focus groups, the imagery related to security was diverse and covered both security-related issues in the broader privacy/security context (e.g., threats, security guards, airports, Homeland Security) and issues in a non-privacy/security context (which were mostly financial-related, including "banks", "retirement", "insurance").

The ensuing discussion of "privacy as a value" differed somewhat from the Canadian focus groups. While participants in the Canadian focus groups tended to lean towards seeing privacy as a value, the perception was notably more pronounced in Chicago. In large part, this reflected a clear belief that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights provides Americans with certain rights, which many participants saw as encompassing the right to privacy.

Consistent with the Canadian focus groups, personal privacy was widely seen as having eroded sharply over the past five years (although a small minority of participants felt that despite eroding over time, there had been little change in the past five years). Similar reasons were cited for this perceived decline, with technology and telemarketing again being identified as the main drivers.

All but a handful of participants believed that there is less privacy today and the participants overwhelming leaned towards expressing concern at its erosion. Like the Canadian focus groups, only a small minority of participants had experienced a "serious" invasion of privacy (although some were quite invasive). Examples included a participant's medical information being disclosed inappropriately by someone in the doctor's office, a participant's doctor disclosing inappropriate and unrelated information to a company related to a workplace accident, and identity theft. When probed on whether certain groups in society are more susceptible to invasions of privacy than others, participants in both the Chicago and Canadian focus groups pointed to similar responses, including both wealthy and low-income individuals, famous individuals, seniors and students. The latter group were seen as being more vulnerable given less life experience and knowledge.

Compared to the Canadian focus groups, however, those in Chicago appeared to have thought more about privacy issues, with many having discussed these issues with family and friends. In part, this reflected a number of things, including:

- The threat of identity theft was much more top-of-mind in Chicago, with a large number of participants having either experienced it or knew someone who had.

- A strong consensus that privacy was under threat to a greater extent in the post 9/11 environment, and a familiarity with a large number of examples of spill-over impacts on privacy (e.g., deportations, the Patriot Act, new banking regulations, being able to track which books individuals borrow from libraries). While many recognized the need for much stronger security, there were numerous concerns expressed about the pendulum swinging too far. Many participants linked concerns about what the government was doing today to the McCarthy era or the activities of J. Edgar Hoover. Several participants spoke about government intrusions in the past, particularly in the context of protests or union movement. Most participants expressed concern over what was happening. As one participant remarked, "It's scary. People are getting used to it and are disengaged."

- The sense that organizations are continually collecting personal information was more pronounced than in the Canadian focus groups, with the commonly held view that information is collected to be "used against individuals". This was seen as being particularly true in relation to health information. One participant pointed to concern over how much his credit card company was able to keep track of his purchases in real time, citing an example where he was travelling to another state and he was called at home almost immediately about "unusual activity" when all he was doing was purchasing gas on a road trip about twelve hours from home. Another participant expressed concern about being sent a birthday card by the AARP (an association for retired persons) on turning 50.

- Despite the fact that many participants held the belief that privacy is a protected right, there also tended to be a stronger sense that Americans' privacy is less protected by legislation, either covering the public or the private sector. Many participants, for example, pointed to HIPPA (the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act). Many saw this legislation as being more "talk" than real protection. Others questioned how they could protect their own privacy if high-profile individuals are unable to do so (e.g., the Bill Clinton/Ken Starr case, the recent disclosure of information about Jack Ryan, a high profile individual who was recently forced to withdraw as the Republican U.S. Senate nominee). One participant even remarked that in his first year of university his student card had his Social Security Number on it.

- The sense of monitoring in the workplace and background employment checks appeared to be more top-of-mind in Chicago, with many believing that it is now widespread and abused today.

- There was high awareness of the recently introduced "Do Not Call" list in relation to telemarketing, with a number of participants having put their name on the list.

When it came to protecting their privacy, the Chicago participants pointed to many of the same things observed in the first round of focus groups, including being proactive in not giving personal information, call-screening, and spam blockers. Like the Canadian focus groups, shredders were also cited – in fact, nearly half of all participants indicated that they had one and used it regularly.

Expectations Regarding Privacy Issues in the Future

The same sense of continuing erosion in privacy was also pervasive in Chicago. Again, this reflected the growing proliferation of technology as observed in the Canadian focus groups. This perceived erosion also reflected a particularly strong sense that the information is becoming increasingly valuable for companies and, as such, they are continually trying to gather more information on consumers. Finally, it was also clear

that privacy was more under threat in the post 9/11 environment. As one participant remarked, "there are more eyeballs (rightly or wrongly) than we know".

When probed on the biggest threats to their privacy in the future, participants pointed to a number of things including:

- Technology;
- Information banks and further integration of databanks;
- Identity theft;
- Financial and related matters; and
- Government intrusions.

Examples of potential threats to their privacy stemming from technology in the future included facial recognition, spy satellites and RFID (radio frequency) technology that is currently being used largely for inventory control. The perception was that the cost of technology will fall dramatically in the future and enable expanded tracking usages.

Privacy Technologies and Legislation

Technology and Its Uses Seen as Value Neutral

There were considerable similarities between the Chicago and Canadian focus groups when it came to broad perceptions about technology. Most participants relied on computers and the Internet to a large extent and also tended to see its uses as largely value-neutral. Like the Canadian focus groups, participants in Chicago saw both pros and cons to technology.

Aside from a few participants working in technology, the overwhelming majority of participants also acknowledged that they did not have enough information to know how technology might affect their personal privacy.

Legislation

Like the Canadian focus groups, the knowledge and awareness of privacy rights and avenues of protection was extremely limited. In fact, few of the participants knew much about any of the different privacy laws in place, although there was some awareness of HIPPA legislation, as mentioned earlier.

In contrast, however, the perception that existing laws would be ineffective at protecting their privacy was more pronounced. In part, this reflected a stronger perception among many participants in the Chicago focus groups that governments themselves cannot be trusted when it comes to their privacy, particularly in the post 9/11 environment. Another reason may be the history of protests in Chicago and the perceived negative involvement of the state. This sense of ineffectiveness was equally (or more) pronounced with respect to the private sector, given the large profits at stake.

Privacy Issues and Workers

As mentioned earlier, the issue of monitoring employees in the workplace was more top-of-mind in the Chicago focus groups and was raised by participants prior to the questions that were to be asked. As one participant remarked, "if they can afford it, they're doing it".

The common view was that monitoring in the workplace was both widespread and acceptable, with most participants believing that employers have a "right" to do things such as monitor productivity, Internet usage and monitor the use of "company" equipment. As one participant summed it up, "we're getting paid on their time". There were, however, some participants who strongly opposed monitoring in the workplace. Some of these participants felt that it was not fair to do so if workers are still getting all their work done – "we're not robots, we cannot continuously work straight for eight hours every day".

While there was a strong inclination towards accepting monitoring in the workplace, some participants (like that observed in the Canadian focus groups) drew a fine line between certain activities as well as activities in different parts of the workday. For example, monitoring personal phone calls was seen as far less acceptable, particularly if an employee was only doing it infrequently.

In contrast to the Canadian focus groups, there was more of an awareness of background checks in the workplace which were seen as pervasive and going further than they need to – "they're collecting information to use against you".

Privacy Issues and Travellers

The combination of the September 11th terrorist attacks and the growing proliferation of the worldwide "travel" of electronic data has shifted much of the privacy landscape for travellers, particularly those that cross international borders. Within this context, the focus groups were designed to probe some of the issues pertinent to travellers.

As a starting point, most participants tended to believe that travellers face far more privacy-related issues than prior to September 11th, pointing most frequently to the tighter security at airports (e.g., removing shoes). One participant pointed to the

frustration he experienced when travelling on a one-way ticket and the attention that it attracted, despite the fact that it was entirely legitimate. In fact, the participant commented that it is never worth it to complain as the process becomes even more arduous if one ever tries to complain.

Unlike the Canadian focus groups, some participants talked about privacy in the context of being tourists in other countries. That is, they talked about the fact that, as Americans, they often stood out and "everybody knows that we're Americans". One participant pointed to being harassed by a European while on a train over being American and what President Bush had done. Another participant told a story about how a hotel operator in Europe said that she was going to charge her more when the operator found out that she was American (originally she was speaking in the country's native language).

While many of the participants expressed frustration about aspects of the tighter security relating to travelling, there was an appreciation of the need for such measures against the threats of terrorism.

Privacy Issues and Consumers

The proliferation of customer loyalty programs in recent years is at the centre of much of the privacy debate today. Within this context, the focus groups were designed to probe this subject and broad attitudes.

Much of the same attitudes observed in the Canadian focus groups were also observed in Chicago, with most participants participating in one program or another. While most participants generally understood that the purpose of these programs was to monitor purchasing habits, this was seen as acceptable for the benefits they got in return. As mentioned earlier, however, the sense that organizations are continually collecting personal information was more pronounced than in the Canadian focus groups. This view tied into the discussion about loyalty programs as there tended to be a stronger sense that information is valuable to companies.

Privacy Issues and Citizens

In recent years, surveillance cameras have become much more commonplace and have become an important part of the privacy debate. Within this context, the focus groups talked about attitudes towards the usage of these cameras.

Like the Canadian focus groups, most participants easily pointed to examples of how surveillance cameras are being used today, and also leaned towards agreeing that their use was acceptable. As with the original focus groups, the discussion then focused specifically on the use of surveillance cameras in public places as they are used in

London, England. Participants were told that there are about 150,000 surveillance cameras operating in London, providing surveillance of almost the entire city.

In the ensuing discussion, there were participants on both sides of the debate. Those who tended to support the concept of having surveillance cameras all around Chicago believed that they were needed from a security/safety perspective. Many of those against did not like the idea of public surveillance and many of them had an underlying belief that they could be used inappropriately (again reflecting the history of protests in the city). This latter group tended to object to cameras on "big-brother" grounds and not wanting to live in a place with such practices. Some of these participants also clearly had less trust in governments and other users of surveillance cameras.

Ranking of Different Types of Privacy

In the final section of the focus groups, participants were asked to complete the same handout used in the Toronto and Montreal focus groups. The handout was designed to rank four types of privacy in two ways: first, rank how important it is to ensure that their privacy is maintained in each of these areas; and second, rank the degree to which participants believed these types of privacy are under threat today.

The handout is included in the appendix. The four types of privacy were:

- Bodily privacy (e.g., being watched or monitored without your knowledge or permission);
- Communication privacy (e.g., someone listening to your conversations or reading your emails without your knowledge or permission);
- Informational privacy (e.g., controlling what information is collected about you); and
- Territorial privacy (e.g., not being disturbed at home, being able to have times when you are completely alone, away from anyone else).

The findings, summarized and compared to the Canadian focus groups in Table 1, show the following[2]:

[2] In the first part, participants were asked to rank the four types of privacy in terms of how important it is to ensure that their privacy is maintained in these areas from 1 to 4, where 1 is most important and 4 is least important. Participants were then asked to rank the same four types in terms of the degree to which these areas of privacy are under threat for them, personally, from 1 to 4, where 1 is most under threat today 4 is least under threat today. Given the nature of qualitative research, these findings should not be interpreted as statistically representative of the Canadian public.

- In broad terms, the same general patterns were observed between the two sets of focus groups.

- Like the Canadian focus groups, there was a great deal of variability in the rankings, reinforcing the fact that privacy concerns are individual in nature and context driven.

- Similarly, all four types of privacy were assigned by at least some participants as the most important to maintain for them personally. Given the small sample size, it is less possible to draw firm conclusions. Still, it is noteworthy that the average ratings are relatively similar to those observed in the Canadian focus groups. Overall, territorial privacy was the least likely to be rated as important to maintain, as it was in the case with the Canadian focus groups.

- When it came to the second part of the exercise, there was also a certain amount of variability in the perceived threat to their privacy in the same four types, albeit to a lesser extent.

- Again, the broad trends were similar between the Chicago and Canadian focus groups, with the perception that informational privacy was the most likely to be under threat (an average rating of 1.35).

Table 1
Ranking of Different Types of Privacy

	Ranking			
	Bodily privacy	Communication privacy	Informational privacy	Territorial privacy
Chicago				
Total Respondents	20	20	20	20
Level of Importance				
Most Important (1)	8	4	6	2
(2)	1	10	6	3
(3)	8	2	3	7
Least Important (4)	3	4	5	8
Average	2.30	2.30	2.35	3.05
Level of Threat				
Most Under Threat (1)	2	2	15	1
(2)	0	11	4	4
(3)	7	6	0	7
Least Under Threat (4)	11	0	1	8
Average	3.35	2.20	1.35	3.10
Toronto and Montreal				
Total Respondents	59	59	59	59
Level of Importance				
Most Important (1)	16	17	20	15
(2)	11	26	13	10
(3)	17	10	16	9
Least Important (4)	15	6	10	25
Average	2.53	2.08	2.27	2.75
Level of Threat				
Most Under Threat (1)	10	15	36	12
(2)	11	22	17	8
(3)	19	17	4	14
Least Under Threat (4)	11	22	17	8
Average	2.80	2.20	1.53	2.88

4.0 Conclusions

The findings from the focus groups pointed to both similarities and differences between the Chicago and Canadian focus groups. In summary, the main conclusions are as follows:

- Like the Canadian focus groups, the view that personal privacy is eroding was prevalent in the Chicago focus groups with most participants feeling the trend will continue in the future. Technology was also seen as a main driver of this erosion, although identity theft was very top-of-mind as well. At the same time, the post-9/11 environment and concerns about what impact it has had on privacy was more pronounced in Chicago.

- While many (but far from all) participants in the group adopted a laissez-faire attitude to their personal privacy, it is clear that large numbers are taking steps to protect it (e.g., shredders).

- Reflecting the differences between the two countries, there appeared to be some differences in the discussions around privacy as a value with a stronger sense that it is in the Chicago focus groups. As mentioned earlier, this reflected a clear belief that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights provides Americans with certain rights, which many participants saw as encompassing the right to privacy. In designing the quantitative phase, it will be important to take into account some of the different historical and societal contexts that exist in the countries to be surveyed as part of the broader study and that these unique environment could be anticipated to affect underlying attitudes towards privacy (e.g., the impact of 9/11, broad indicators of trust in government and the private sector more generally).

- The sense that their privacy would be adequately protected by legislation appeared to be less pronounced in Chicago. In part, this reflected a sense that privacy is under threat by government on many fronts in the post-9/11 environment and a more pervasive sense about the private sector trying to gather information. Again, this should be taken into account at the design stage for the quantitative phase.

Appendix A: Moderator's Guide

Globalization of Personal Data Project – International Survey

Moderator's Guide

1. Introduction (5 minutes)

- Moderator explains the purpose of the research and who is the client.

- Mention that the discussion is being audiotaped as the moderator cannot take good notes during the focus group.

- Mention that participants are being observed by members of the research team.

- Confidentiality: Explain that the findings from the focus groups are kept confidential. No full names will be associated with any information provided in this discussion group. The report will simply describe patterns of opinions over the series of focus groups.

- Explanation of format and "ground rules": there are no wrong answers/no right answers, okay to disagree, individuals are asked to speak one at a time.

- Moderator's role: raise issues for discussion, watch for time and make sure that everyone gets a chance to speak.

- Ask participants if they have any questions before beginning.

- Participant introductions: ask participants to introduce themselves by their first name only and to say a little bit about their background (e.g., occupation/status).

2. Perceptions and Experiences with Privacy Issues (40 minutes)

- When you hear the word "privacy", what is the first thing that comes to mind?

  [Moderator instructs participants to write down the first thing that comes to mind.]

- And when you hear the word "security", what is the first thing that comes to mind?

  [*Moderator instructs participants to write down the first thing that comes to mind.*]

- Respondents are then asked to read what they wrote down about "privacy" and "security".

- People often talk about privacy as a value. What is a value [PROMPT: freedom, equality are often cited as values]? What about privacy as a value?

- In our surveys, we often ask people about privacy, and whether or not they feel that they have less privacy in their daily life than they did five years ago. How would you answer this question?
  - Can you tell us why you feel that way?
  - In what areas do you have less privacy?

- How concerned are you about your privacy today? ·
  - What kinds of things do you do to protect your privacy?
  - Where do you generally get your information about privacy issues?
  - Have you ever discussed these issues with family, friends?

- How have your views changed in the past five years? In what ways?
  - What prompted these changes? Is anything different since September 11th?

- Has anything you have seen in the media (TV, radio programming, newspaper, magazines, online information or advertising) prompted these changes? How so?

- Have you ever experienced a serious invasion of privacy?
  - What kind of invasion of privacy was it?

- Can you give me some examples of privacy invasions?
  - Invasions in your day-to-day lives?
  - Invasions by government?
  - Invasions by companies?
  - Invasions in the workplace?

- What are some other ways that your privacy could be compromised?
  - [Prompt if necessary: identity theft, credit information, credit card, financial information, surveillance cameras, tracking of purchases].

- Are some groups in society more susceptible to invasions of privacy than others? Which groups? [PROMPT: Low-income, visible minorities, ethnic groups] Why do you say that?

3. Expectations Regarding Privacy Issues in the Future (15 minutes)

- How likely is it that you will actually experience a serious invasion of your personal privacy over the next five years? What type of invasion could you see happening?

- Compared to today, do you think that the threat of an invasion of your personal privacy will be greater or less in ten years from now? Why do you say that?

- What do you think may not be as private in the future?

- If I asked you to pick one thing, what would you say is the biggest threat to your privacy in the future?

- How do you think technology will affect your personal privacy in the future?

4. Awareness of and Attitudes towards Privacy Technologies and Legislation (30 minutes)

Technologies

- How much do you rely on electronic or computer-based technology in your daily life, either at home or at work?
  - What types of technology do you use?
- How confident would you say you have enough information to know how technology might affect your personal privacy? What about the Internet?
- How could the Internet affect your privacy? And what about email?
- Are you aware of things that you could do to protect your privacy while on the Internet?
  - Have you ever done anything to protect your privacy while on the Internet?
- Have there been any changes with respect to the use of these technologies by companies/governments in the past few years when it comes to your privacy?
  - In what way have things changed?
  - What do you think prompted this change?

Legislation

- What things exist to protect your privacy today? What laws exist?
- Are you aware that there are federal privacy laws that place strict restrictions on how federal government departments use personal information, including restrictions on the sharing of personal information?
  - To what extent do you believe these laws are effective at protecting your privacy?
- What about laws that place restrictions on how companies use personal information, including restrictions on the sharing of personal information?
  - To what extent do you believe these laws are effective at protecting your privacy?

- [As some of you mentioned] some measures aimed at increasing security are, at times at the expense of privacy. Do you think this is currently the case?
  - Specifically, what security measures compromise privacy?
  - On balance, do you feel these measures aimed at increasing security are justified?
  - What about in the future? Do you expect the emphasis will be more on "security" or "personal privacy"?

5. Privacy Issues Specific to Workers (25 minutes)

- To what extent do you think companies keep track of the activities of employees while they are in the workplace?
  - Are they tracking how much time employees spend online, maintaining a list of websites employees visit and information entered? Emails sent or received?
  - Should they be allowed to monitor these types of activities of their employees? What types of activities? Why? Why not?
  - What is and isn't personal information in the workplace?
- Do you know if your employer uses any methods to track the actions of their employees? How do you feel about this?
- Do you believe businesses are required to inform employees and prospective employees of different methods they may use to monitor workplace activities?
- Should employers be able to monitor all their employees equally or should they be able to target or exempt individuals or groups of employees from monitoring?

6. Privacy Issues Specific to Travelers (25 minutes)

- Do Americans who travel a lot face any privacy-issues that non-travelers do not?
  - What types of things are different?
  - What about those that travel regularly between other countries?

- Many Americans fly, either for business-reasons or for personal reasons. [Moderator asks for a show of hands in terms of who has flown by air for business reasons in the past year, and who has personally travelled by air in the past 5 years internationally for either business or personal reasons].
  - Those who have travelled for business reasons, do you feel that you have less privacy travelling today than you did in the past? Why?
  - What about those who have travelled for personal reasons?
  - Are you concerned about any of the changes or is it just part of the new need to increase security?

- To what extent should the Government track the movements of visitors as they exit or re-enter the United States? What about tracking the movements of American citizens as they exit or re-enter the United States?
  - Should information collected be shared with other governments or international agencies? Why do you say that?

- After September 11th, the United States required advance information on all air travelers destined for the United States.
  - Were you aware of this requirement? What, if any concerns, do you have with this?
  - Should information collected be shared with other governments or international agencies? Why do you say that?

7. Privacy Issues Specific to Consumers (25 minutes)

- How many of you have ever participated in a customer loyalty program such as Airmiles?
  - What is the purpose of these programs?
  - Why do you participate?
  - What type of personal information do they collect? What do they do with this personal information?
  - Can they sell this personal information to other companies? Under what circumstances can they? [FOR THOSE IN LOYALTY PROGRAMS] Have you given consent?

- As some of you may know, when individuals take part in a loyalty program such as Airmiles, each time they use their card to collect points, the Airmiles company keeps track of the items they have purchased. These companies can then sell this "purchasing behaviour" information to other companies participating in the Airmiles loyalty program.
  - What do you think of a company being able to track purchases?
  - What do you think of them being able to transmit that information to other companies?
  - What kinds of things is it ok for companies to monitor?

- Have any of you ever made a purchase over the Internet? Why/why not?
  - What prompted you to make your first purchase over the Internet?
  - Did you think it would be safe?

- What about privacy policies on websites and e-commerce websites in particular?
  - What do you think of these policies?
  - Who actually reads them?
  - Are they adequate measures of privacy protection? Are they all equal, or does your view about the privacy policies depend on the company? Why?

8. Privacy Issues Specific to Citizens (25 minutes)

- Let's turn to the issue of surveillance cameras. How are surveillance cameras being used in your community? How are they being used elsewhere in the country?
  - Where are they located?
  - What are they used for?
  - Who operates them?
  - What purpose do they serve?

- In London England, police are using surveillance cameras to monitor public places in order to deter crime and assist in the prosecution of offenders? In fact, there are roughly 150,000 surveillance cameras operating in London.
  - What do you think of surveillance cameras in public places? What are the pros? What are the cons?
  - Do you think this is an effective way to reduce crime?
  - Are their other more effective ways?

- What would you think if a city like Chicago was to follow the lead of a London, England and introduce surveillance cameras all across the city?
  - Good idea? Bad idea?
  - Would you have any concerns? What?
  - How comfortable are you with the idea of being monitored by a police surveillance camera as you walk down a street or go to a park?

9. Concluding Questions (10 minutes)

- Have participants answer the handout.

- Is there anything else you would like to add before we end the discussion?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

ATTITUDES ON PRIVACY

Some privacy experts talk about four different types of privacy: bodily privacy, communication privacy, informational privacy, and territorial privacy.

How would you RANK these different types of privacy in terms of how important it is for you to ensure that your privacy is maintained in these four areas? [Please rank the four types listed below with a 1 to 4, where 1 is most important and 4 is least important].

Bodily privacy (e.g., being watched or monitored without your knowledge or permission) _____

Communication privacy (e.g., someone listening to your conversations or reading your emails without your knowledge or permission) _____

Informational privacy (e.g., controlling what information is collected about you). _____

Territorial privacy (e.g., not being disturbed at home, being able to have times when you are completely alone, away from anyone else) _____

And how would you rank the same four types in terms of the degree to which these areas of privacy are under threat for you, personally? [Please rank the four types listed below with a 1 to 4, where 1 is most under threat today 4 is least under threat today].

Bodily privacy (e.g., being watched or monitored without your knowledge or permission) _____

Communication privacy (e.g., someone listening to your conversations or reading your emails without your knowledge or permission) _____

Informational privacy (e.g., controlling what information is collected about you). _____

Territorial privacy (e.g., not being disturbed at home, being able to have times when you are completely alone, away from anyone else) _____