Department of Social Research
University of Helsinki
Helsinki

# LUDIC SURVEILLANCE

## EXAMINING MUNDANE SURVEILLANCE PRACTICES AT THE INTERFACE OF CONTROL AND PLAY

**Liisa A. Mäkinen**

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences of
the University of Helsinki, for public examination in Auditorium XIII,
University main building, on 31 March 2017, at 12 noon.

Helsinki 2017

Cover layout: Riikka Hyypiä and Hanna Sario

Cover photo: Mika Hyötyläinen

# ABSTRACT

This doctoral thesis investigates private surveillance practices in everyday life, ranging from control-related monitoring to watching for familial care, for both practical and playful purposes. The focus is on individual camera surveillance practices in private and semi-private places such as homes and recreational surroundings. The work is located in the field of Surveillance Studies.

The research builds on the view that surveillance in its current form cannot be conceptualized merely in the framework of control, and recognizes that play can be offered as an alternative. Consequently, the objective is to examine how private surveillance practices can be placed in between, and beyond, frames of control and play. Furthermore, the aim is to examine how surveillance traditionally understood as a control-related activity can be connected to game-like and playful practices on a theoretical level.

The study includes four research articles and a summary article. The main body of the empirical data is comprised of qualitative interviews (N:23) collected in Finland with users of private surveillance equipment. Two articles build on interview data, one is a case study (on an online surveillance application) and one is grounded on a theoretical analysis of playful traits in surveillance practices.

The main result from the empirical data is that while private surveillance practices connect to forms of control-related monitoring and playful watching practices, uses are not limited to either but combine and add to them. A particularly interesting combination of the two is manifested in gamified surveillance, where surveillants might operate playfully, but surveillance is still authoritative. Control and play can indeed happen simultaneously. Five types of surveillance produced with domestic surveillance systems are recognized: controlling, caring, recreational, communicational and sincere. Furthermore, online cameras are analysed as practical devices which enable a convenient way to monitoring places and property which are important to the users.

The key result on the theoretical level is the metaphorical model of surveillance analysis presented in two of the articles. This research introduces five novel metaphors for future surveillance analysis: 1) cat-and-mouse, 2) hide-and-seek, 3) labyrinth, 4) sleight-of-hand, and 5) poker. The metaphorical approach to surveillance practices proposes that control-related surveillance can be analysed from a ludic perspective.

This study furthers both empirical and theoretical understanding of private surveillance practices and surveillance taking place at the interfaces of control and play. The underlying argument is that, in addition to control and play, convenience should be considered a framework for analysing private surveillance practices. Consequently, the positions of surveillance subjects should also be rethought.

# ABSTRAKTI

Väitöskirjassani tarkastelen yksityisiä valvonnan muotoja arkielämässä. Arkinen valvonta sisältää kontrolliin liittyvää monitorointia, huolenpitoa perheestä ja lähimmäisistä, sekä monenlaista tarkkailua käytännöllisistä ja leikkisistä lähtökohdista. Tutkimus kohdistuu valvontakameroiden käyttöihin yksityisissä ja puolijulkisissa tiloissa, kuten kodeissa ja harrastuksiin liittyvissä paikoissa. Työ sijoittuu valvontatutkimuksen kentälle.

Tutkimuksessa väitän että valvontaa nykymuodossaan ei voi käsitteellistää pelkästään kontrollin viitekehyksessä. Kontrollin ohella leikkiä ja leikkisyyttä on ehdotettu vaihtoehtoisiksi analyysikehikoiksi. Tutkimuksen tavoitteena on arvioida, kuinka yksityiset valvontakäytännöt asettuvat kontrollin ja leikin viitekehyksien välille sekä laajentavat niitä. Lisäksi tutkimus pyrkii analysoimaan, kuinka perinteisesti kontrollitoimena käsitetty valvonta yhdistyy pelillisyyteen ja leikkisyyteen teoreettisella tasolla.

Tutkimus rakentuu neljän tieteellisen artikkelin ja yhteenvetoluvun varaan. Pääosan empiirisestä datasta muodostaa laadullinen haastatteluaineisto (N:23), joka koostuu eri-ikäisten valvontaa arkielämässään käyttävien suomalaisten haastatteluista. Artikkeleista kaksi perustuu haastatteluaineistoon, kolmas on tapaustutkimus (valvonta-aiheisesta internetsivustosta) ja neljäs analysoi valvonnan leikkisiä aspekteja teoreettisella tasolla.

Empiirisen analyysin päätulos on, että vaikka yksityiset valvontakäytännöt sisältävät kontrolliin ja leikkisyyteen liittyvää monitorointia, käytöt eivät ole rajoittuneita kumpaankaan kontekstiin vaan yhdistävät ja laajentavat niitä. Pelillistetty valvonta on erityisen kiinnostava kontrollin ja leikin yhdistelmä, joka havainnollistaa, että vaikka monitorointi suoritetaan leikkisässä kontekstissa, valvonta voi silti olla autoritaarista. Kodeissa toteutettava valvonta on jaettavissa viiteen luokkaan: kontrolloivaan, huolta pitävään, viihteelliseen, viestinnälliseen ja vilpittömään. Analysoin kameroita käytännöllisinä laitteina, jotka mahdollistavat kätevän tavan monitoroida katselijalle merkityksellisiä paikkoja ja ihmisiä.

Teoreettisella tasolla tutkimuksen päätulos on viisi uutta valvonnan metaforaa. Nämä metaforat ovat: 1) kissa ja hiiri, 2) piiloleikki, 3) labyrintti, 4) silmänkääntötemppu ja 5) pokeri. Metaforien avulla on mahdollista tutkia, kuinka valvonta ja valvottuna oleminen voi sisältää leikkisiä muotoja.

Tutkimus edistää sekä empiiristä että teoreettista ymmärrystä yksityisistä valvontakäytännöistä ja valvonnasta kontrollin ja leikin välimaastossa. Väitän, että kontrollin ja leikin lisäksi käytännöllisyys on hyödyllinen viitekehys analysoitaessa yksityisiä valvontakäytäntöjä. Tämä avaa uusia suuntia myös valvonnan kohteen tutkimukseen.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not exist without wonderful scholars in my academic community, colleagues, friends and family.

First and foremost, I owe a debt to my supervisor, Professor Hille Koskela. Hille is the reason I became interested in surveillance in the first place. In 2003 I read an article collection with her paper in it and was immediately inspired. Before that moment, no topic had felt both practically and analytically as meaningful and rich as surveillance. I was fortunate to have Hille examine my Bachelor's thesis in 2008, supervise my Master's thesis in 2010, and, after my graduation in 2010, hire me as a researcher in the Academy of Finland project she was leading. Hille is a very special kind of mentor. She is one of those rare scholars who never thinks inside the box. Hille has an unprecedented talent to inspire those around her and become excited about ideas shared with her. We have sat at her kitchen table on numerous evenings discussing surveillance with gin and tonic glasses in front of us. Building on those discussion we have written four articles together, two of which are included in this thesis. For all her work in reading and constructively commenting on my work, creating and sounding out ideas, guiding me through the academic world, and encouraging me to always aim higher, a simple thank you seems very insufficient.

Maria Heiskanen's role in helping me conduct and finish this work cannot be exaggerated. We started our PhDs around the same time in 2011 and have been working mostly side by side – at first in adjacent offices, and then, for the past year and a half, in the same room. Maria is an excellent researcher, a supportive and warm colleague, and a dear friend. She has helped me develop my thinking, improve my analytical skills and pointed me towards interesting themes connected to her own research. We have reviewed each other's manuscripts on countless occasions, rehearsed presentations, organized science events, maintained a blog, hosted a debating society, and travelled together to distant conferences. Without Maria, everything would have been much less fun.

My sincere appreciation goes to Senior Fellow Gavin J.D. Smith and Professor Kevin D. Haggerty for pre-examining this work and providing their valuable and positive feedback and suggestions for future research. I am also grateful to Associate Professor David J. Phillips for agreeing to be my opponent at the public defence of this thesis. It is an honour for me to have my work assessed by such esteemed scholars.

I thank Associate Professor Valerie Steeves for being my mentor through the Surveillance Studies Network's Mentorship programme in 2013, and for giving me constructive comments on my research proposal. Valerie's own research on surveillance and privacy among young people is profoundly inspiring and I hope to work together with her in the future. In the academic

# CONTENTS

# LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following publications:

I       Mäkinen, L. A. (2016). Surveillance ON/OFF. Examining home surveillance systems from the users' perspective. *Surveillance & Society*, 14, 59–77.

II      Mäkinen, L. A. (submitted). Examination of online camera usages at the interface of Surveillance Studies and Internet Studies.

III     Mäkinen, L. A., & Koskela, H. (2014). Surveillance as a reality game. In A. Jansson & M. Christensen (Eds.), *Media, surveillance and identity. Social perspectives* (pp. 183–200). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

IV      Koskela, H., & Mäkinen, L. A. (2016). Ludic encounters – Understanding surveillance though game metaphors. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19, 1523–1538.

These publications are referred to in the text by their roman numerals.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

*Some time ago on a peaceful Sunday morning I was taking a pleasant stroll through my home neighbourhood in Helsinki. I had nowhere special to go; I was just walking around, enjoying my day off. At one point I noticed four young boys, about ten years old, running and playing, doing what kids at that age do. Suddenly one of them stopped, and asked the others to stop too. They were standing in front of a university building, close to a door which had a surveillance camera pointing at people entering and exiting the building. One of the boys tiptoed to the door, stopped in front of it, paused and looked at the camera. He stood there still for a few seconds, staring at the camera. I had paused as well, intrigued to see what would happen. The boy reached into his pocket and took his hand out, mimicking a gun. Then he placed the 'gun' against his temple, pulled the 'trigger' and fell to the ground, 'dead'. The other boys stood there, silent, staring at him. The moment lasted only a few seconds but it felt much longer. Then the boys started laughing and ran away.*

This thesis explores private surveillance practices in everyday life, ranging from control-related monitoring and using camera surveillance equipment for mitigating mundane insecurities to watching for familial care, both for practical and playful reasons. The focus is on individual camera surveillance practices in places such as homes and recreational places. [1] The opening anecdote exemplify how surveillance can be experienced by people – in this case young people – through performance. More than a mere instrument of control, for the boys in this story the surveillance camera was a plaything, a part of their merrymaking, and the scene played out by one of them was reminiscent of a number of movies and TV series. This example also illustrates how the tension between control and play can intrigue the imagination – not only in everyday life practices of children and adults, but in academia as well. Indeed, in the past decade surveillance scholars have increasingly paid attention to the playful side of surveillance rather than focusing merely on its controlling aspects (Albrechtslund & Dubbeld, 2005; Andrejevic, 2007; Ellerbrok, 2010, 2011; Koskela, 2006; McGrath, 2004; Smith, 2007). This research continues in that tradition.

Undeniably, surveillance is not a new phenomenon as people have, perhaps always, monitored each other for certain purposes, such as work-related organization. However, there is some debate over how its character has

---

[1] The concept of 'surveillance' is defined in more detail in chapter two, but for the purposes of this introduction I use surveillance as a shorthand term to describe everyday life social process where personal details are collected, or focused attention is paid to them for purposes of influencing, managing, protecting or directing. (See e.g. Lyon, 1994, 2001, 2007, 2014; Bogard, 2006; Rule, 2007).

changed in the modern era. Although the fundamental operations of surveillance might not have changed, the development of technique has increased the volume of surveillance, as technology enables data gathering at unprecedented levels (Lyon, 1994). Technological developments have led to the argument that surveillance is, if not 'a central feature' (ibid., p. 26), at least 'a distinguishing feature' of modernity (Ball & Webster, 2003, p. 1).

Currently, various surveillance-related technologies are more readily available for public use than before. The prices of surveillance equipment have declined, technology itself has improved, and new types of surveillant applications have been developed. Thus, surveillance is not merely an activity for the authorities, targeting downwards, but private individuals are able to monitor their peers and authorities too. Surveillance has become decentralized. (See e.g. Andrejevic, 2007; Ball & Webster, 2003; Koskela, 2009a, 2011a; McGrath, 2004.)

Before the surge in the field now known as Surveillance Studies, surveillance as a research topic was approached by scholars such as Karl Marx, who located surveillance in the management of labour; Max Weber, who connected surveillance to bureaucratic rationality; and Michel Foucault, who analysed surveillance in the context of discipline (Lyon, 1994, pp. 24–27). As surveillance is a multidisciplinary research topic, it can easily be approached from different perspectives, ranging from sociology and history to geography and law, to name but a few. However, private surveillance practices have received little attention from surveillance scholars. While researchers might know about technologies and policies of surveillance, they know surprisingly little about people and their ordinary patterns of surveillance (Lyon, 2014).

This doctoral dissertation aims to fill the said gap by exploring surveillance in the everyday life practices of (Western) individuals. Specifically, this thesis examines how video camera equipment is used for mundane (monitoring) purposes in everyday life surroundings, and how these practices exist between, and possibly beyond, frames of control and play. Indeed, this research begins from the notion that surveillance in its current form cannot be conceptualized merely in the framework of control, and recognizes that play and playfulness have been offered as alternative frames (e.g. Ellerbork, 2011). The tension between surveillance as an instrument of control and as a playful practice remains a constant in this dissertation. The word ludic, by definition, means 'showing spontaneous and undirected playfulness' and 'of, relating to, or characterized by play'. [2] Thus, *ludic surveillance* could be defined as playful surveillance or surveillance characterized by play.

The objectives of this research are placed on two levels: empirical and theoretical. On the empirical level my aim is to provide new information on the uses and experiences of surveillance equipment, particularly cameras, in

---

[2] See the Oxford (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ludic), and the Merriam-Webster Dictionaries (www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ludic) for these definitions. The word *ludus* in Latin includes the whole field of play (Huizinga, 1938/1955, p. 35).

homes and other semi-private places. I ask how private surveillance practices are motivated on the one hand by control, fear and preparedness towards individual risks and on the other hand by more playful reasons. The empirical data collected for this research is comprised of interviews (N: 23) conducted in Finland with users of private surveillance equipment. My second objective is to focus on the connections between play, games and surveillance at a more theoretical and conceptual level. Theorizing surveillance in this thesis is in part based on the empirical data gathered, but also builds on previous research on the topic. On the theoretical level I ask how surveillance as a control-related activity intersects with games and play through gamification, and how the vocabulary of play and games could be utilized in the theoretical analysis of surveillance.

These objectives are formed into two main research questions, empirical and theoretical, summarized below. Both main research questions have two subordinate research questions.

1. To what extent can private surveillance practices be seen in terms of control, fear, preparedness towards individual risks and playfulness?
   a. Why is (surveillance) camera equipment installed in private or semi-private premises?
   b. How are these (surveillance) camera systems used? What type of surveillance is produced through them? [3]
2. How does surveillance as a control-related activity connect with game-like and playful practices?
   a. How are private surveillance practices encouraged through turning surveillance into a game?
   b. How can surveillance practices be analysed through games and play?

This thesis is comprised of four separate research articles and this summary article. Below I briefly summarize the content of the four articles and how each contributes to the research questions. The first article, *Surveillance ON/OFF: Examining home surveillance systems from the user's perspective*, examines surveillance produced with domestic surveillance systems and analyses the meanings and implications of that surveillance to the resident. The article analyses how residents use surveillance equipment in their daily lives, being both operators and targets of their systems. I argue that surveillance produced with home surveillance systems needs to be understood more broadly than in terms of the control-care setting as five types of surveillance are produced with these systems: controlling, caring, recreational, communicational, and sincere surveillance. This article is empirical in nature and focuses on the first main research question with its subquestions.

---

[3] In these questions 'surveillance' is put in brackets as not all the cameras investigated in this thesis can be primarily defined as surveillance cameras.

The second article, *Examination of online camera usages at the interface of Surveillance Studies and Internet Studies*, is grounded on the argument that the separation of research on surveillance cameras and webcams into two different fields, Surveillance and Internet Studies, is artificial and hinders recognizing some more novel aspects of everyday life usages of these devices. Various online cameras enable both practices related to monitoring for control and playful modes of watching. In this article I explore the uses of online cameras in three specific places: homes, a place connected to recreation and a place connected to studying. The cameras are analysed within four themes: how they enable presence, activity, entertainment and surveillance. I argue that more than being merely entertainment devices or surveillance systems these cameras operate as practical devices enabling watchers to mitigate mundane insecurities in their lives and allowing them a convenient way to monitor places (or property) which are important to them. This article combines empirical and theoretical approaches and, like Article I, focuses on the first main research question with its subquestions.

The third article, *Surveillance as a reality game*, is co-authored with Hille Koskela, and sets out to explore the game-like nature of surveillance practices by considering how people conduct monitoring in a gamified setting, thus turning surveillance into a game. As a case example we analyse the UK-based Internet site InternetEyes (described in detail on page 26). Based on our analysis we argue that as a peer-to-peer surveillance site InternetEyes differs from previously recognized types of participation in surveillance. The site combines online and offline spaces in a manner which differs from other ways of broadcasting surveillance material online, particularly that of (crime) reality TV. Furthermore, the site combines surveillance and a game in a way that might make watchers forget that the events they are monitoring are actually happening. This article focuses on the second main research question and particularly its first subquestion.

The fourth article, *Ludic encounters – Understanding surveillance through game metaphors*, is also co-authored with Koskela, and further explores the connections between games/play and surveillance. Instead of examining playful uses of surveillance technologies or surveillance practices in games, in this article games and play are approached as metaphors. These metaphors, which were originally presented in Article III, are developed and theoretically analysed further in this article. The examined metaphors are: 1) cat-and-mouse, 2) hide-and-seek, 3) labyrinth, 4) sleight-of-hand, and 5) poker. Although the fourth article is mainly theoretical in nature, two sets of specific cases from urban settings and virtual surroundings are presented to clarify our arguments. This article focuses on the second main research questions, particularly the latter subquestion.

The aim of this summary article is to further examine the themes analysed in the four articles. Their background and theoretical analysis is deepened and expanded and they are approached more as a part of a whole than as separate articles. This summary article is divided into six chapters. Following this

introduction, the second chapter focuses on previous research on surveillance, concentrating specifically on peer-to-peer surveillance, camera surveillance, and risk, fear and play in the context of surveillance practices. The third chapter presents the data and methods of the analysis. The findings from four research articles are presented in chapters four and five. Chapter four summarizes the empirical findings from Articles I and II and analyses them particularly in the context of the first set of research questions. Chapter five presents the theoretical analysis from Articles III and IV and focuses on the second set of research questions. The sixth and final chapter draws together the arguments made and discusses in more detail both empirical and theoretical findings in the context of the larger research problem of examining surveillance within the frameworks of control and play and beyond.

# 2 FRAMING THE RESEARCH

In this chapter I analyse surveillance as a concept and examine perspectives on private participation in surveillance, particularly focusing on two large and opposing frames grounding this discussion: risk and fear and playfulness. Throughout this thesis by risk I refer to 'the probability of danger, injury, illness, death or other misfortune associated with a hazard' (Furedi, 1997, p. 17). My focus is particularly on individual and small-scale risks. [4] Furthermore, the concepts 'play' and 'playful' in my analysis are set against the traditional manner of analysing surveillance within the framework of control, with control at one end of the continuum, and play and playfulness at the other. However, playfulness is not the only other framework besides control through which surveillance practices can and have been meaningfully analysed (for more detail, see subchapter 2.3).

The first subchapter (2.1) below investigates some of the definitions of surveillance and recent discussion on defining the concept. It specifically focuses on defining and analysing various types of peer-to-peer surveillance (sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2), which I use as an umbrella term covering different kinds of participation in surveillance. The second and the third subchapter explore fear, risk and individual preparedness (2.2) and playful and other non control-related motives for private surveillance practices (2.3). Finally, the last subchapter (2.4) briefly introduces research on camera surveillance and webcams. [5]

## 2.1 DEFINING SURVEILLANCE

Surveillance as a concept once had a narrower meaning than at present, and was mostly connected to policing or espionage (Lyon, 1994). In his 1994 book, *The Electronic Eye*, David Lyon used the concept of surveillance as 'a

---

[4] By focusing on risk at the individual level I view the discussion differently than Ulrich Beck (1992), who studied present-day risks as 'global dangers', thus contrasting them to 'personal risks' from earlier times. The risks Beck refer to 'endanger all forms of life on this planet', whereas the risks I examine operate on the private level and are thus more reminiscent of personal risks of earlier times.

[5] Webcams have been previously defined as 'small digital cameras of varying quality that are connected to the internet, uploading […] images of whatever is in front of the camera to a webpage for public viewing' (Wise, 2004, p. 425). However, as nowadays it is common to use the Internet as a tool in distributing and accessing feed from all types of cameras, the webcam as a term seems slightly outdated. In Article II, I suggest replacing the term with 'online camera', which includes all types of cameras where the feed/images are routed online but permission to access that feed/those images differs. For the sake of clarity, I use the term webcam throughout this summary article when referring to previous research on the subject.

shorthand term to cover the many, and expanding, range of contexts within which personal data is collected by employment, commercial and administrative agencies, as well as in policing and security' (ibid., p. ix). This definition remained unaltered in his later books, such as *Surveillance Society* (2001), where he defined surveillance as 'any collection and processing of personal data, whether identifiable or not, for the purposes of influencing or managing those whose data have been garnered' (Lyon, 2001, p. 2) and *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (2007), where surveillance was framed as 'the focused, systematic and routine attention to personal details for purposes of influence, management, protection or direction' (Lyon, 2007, p. 14).

Lyon's definitions, particularly that from 2001, are perhaps the most often cited definitions of surveillance. Seeing surveillance in this way analyses it as a function of power operating from above, targeting below, and as such it relies heavily on the works of Foucault, particularly *Discipline and Punish* (1977), where using the idea of the panopticon Foucault analyses modern disciplinary power. The Panopticon is an architectural design of a prison presented by Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century. It is a round structure with an inspection tower in the middle and prison cells circling it. From the tower it is possible to see into every cell, but from the cells it is impossible to see inside the tower. Thus, from the tower all cells and all prisoners are visible, but those in the cells have no way of knowing whether or not they are watched. According to Foucault, this potential for constant surveillance leads to internalized discipline and self-control. (Foucault, 1977.)

For a long time, discipline, control and the panopticon metaphor were the context within which surveillance was researched. Much of Surveillance Studies, however, has undergone a shift in the past decade or so, where both the understanding of surveillance and the framing of research have changed. Surveillance is no longer seen merely as a top-down control mechanism, but is also understood as a habit in which an increasing number of people can participate (e.g. Albrechtslund, 2008; Albrechtslund & Dubbeld, 2005; Andrejevic, 2007; Ball & Webster, 2003; Ellerbrok, 2010, 2011; Haggerty, 2006; Koskela, 2009a; McGrath, 2004).

One term describing this change is the intensification of surveillance. In brief it means that with extensive information and communications technologies (ICTs) surveillance is more organized and technology-based than before, and as such it has become a routine element in everyday life (Ball & Webster, 2003, p. 2). Besides allowing the state and corporations to gather more and more precise information on citizens and customers, ICT has increased the opportunities for people themselves to access surveillance to monitor their peers (Andrejevic, 2007; Bruno, 2012). With the surge of new technology, the public is not merely targeted by surveillance, but they conduct it themselves by, for instance, monitoring each other with mobile phones and through social media sites and giving information on themselves online. This type of peer-to-peer monitoring can be based on private interests, but it can also be requested by the state or commercial entities.

In 2014, Lyon (2014, p. 72) argued that surveillance has changed into 'an everyday social experience, from a serious security issue to an incessant demand for data from numerous organizations to a playful part of mediated relationships'. With this definition, surveillance is no longer viewed only through 'hierarchies of visibility' (Haggerty, 2006, p. 29), where those executing surveillance have control and those watched are less powerful, but surveillance can be 'a playful experience for the users' (Monahan, 2011, p. 500). However, the notion of control is still understood to be essential when considering if or not surveillance occurs, as without control 'all interactions with ICTs would constitute a surveillant relationship' (Monahan, 2010, p. 8).

Analysing surveillance as a playful experience brings out more clearly the two-sided nature of surveillance, as to surveil something can mean to watch over or to guard it (Bogard, 2006, p. 98). Lyon (1994), like many others, has on several occasions noted that surveillance is not unequivocally bad or good: it does not automatically 'entail harmful intent' (Rule, 2007, p. 14). There are, however, also opposite views. Christian Fuchs (2011), for instance, takes a strictly normative stand towards surveillance by arguing that it should be defined in a negative sense. [6]

These various definitions of surveillance show how as a practice it has changed and developed in the past few decades. From these characterizations it might seem that understanding surveillance as an oppressive and negative practice would be quite different from analysing it as a playful activity. However, the following two sections aim to illustrate that surveillance, and particularly peer-to-peer surveillance, can be investigated as a positive, empowering practice connected to day-to-day activities, but it can also be analysed as an expansion of state or commercial control and as such is more closely linked to negative aspects of surveillance. Thus, these two extremes might not in fact be as far from each other as they seem at first.

### 2.1.1   DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEER-TO-PEER SURVEILLANCE

The positive and empowering aspects of peer-to-peer surveillance have been mainly researched in online contexts and particularly in relation to social media sites. As online sociability demands some level of voluntary disclosure of personal details, it is an intriguing arena for research related to surveillance. Two concepts have been particularly dominant in this research: 'participatory surveillance' (Albrechtslund, 2008) and 'social surveillance' (Marwick, 2012).

---

[6] Fuchs criticizes the notion of decentralized surveillance, and argues that even though people are able to use and do use digital technologies for surveillance purposes, 'the state and capitalists have much more resources than civil society and citizens, which enables them to conduct much more intensive and extensive forms of surveillance' (Fuchs, 2015, p. 7). Even though I agree with Fuchs that the state and commercial monitoring can be more intense than civil or peer-to-peer monitoring, I do not recognize them as only or even more important forms of monitoring. Furthermore, it seems they are not necessarily as different from each other as Fuchs sees them.

Besides these two concepts, 'lateral surveillance' (Andrejevic, 2005) and 'hijacked surveillance' (Koskela, 2009a) are often used in analysing private participation in surveillance. For the sake of clarity, all four concepts are briefly introduced in Table 1 below before being discussed in more detail.

*Table 1 Different forms of peer-to-peer surveillance*

| Concept describing peer-to-peer surveillance | Who introduced the concept (year) | Definition of the concept |
|---|---|---|
| Participatory surveillance | Anders Albrechtslund (2008) | Participatory surveillance comprises 'user empowerment', 'building of subjectivity', 'sharing practices' and 'mutuality' (Albrectslund, 2008, par. 4). It focuses on social media. |
| Social surveillance | Alice Marwick (2012) | Social surveillance includes 'closely examining content created by others and looking at one's own content through other people's eyes' (Marwick, 2012, p. 378). It focuses on social media. |
| Lateral surveillance | Mark Andrejevic (2005) | Lateral surveillance entails 'the use of surveillance tools by individuals, rather than by agents of institutions public or private, to keep track of one another'. It 'covers (but is not limited to) three main categories: romantic interests, family, and friends or acquaintances'. (Andrejevic, 2005, p. 481, p. 488.) |
| Hijacked surveillance | Hille Koskela (2009a, 2011a) | Hijacking surveillance entails individuals 'using surveillance equipment to produce visual materials for [...] different purposes'. It can also involve people playing 'with equipment that has surveillance capabilities'. (Koskela, 2011a, p. 273.) |

Anders Albrechtslund (2008) examines online social networking as peer-to-peer surveillance, and suggests that participatory surveillance could be used as a concept to describe this type of monitoring. Instead of viewing online social networking in terms of privacy concerns or online snooping, he argues that much can be revealed by looking at the social practices within these sites. Participatory surveillance includes mutuality and sharing practices and empowers users of online social networking sites to build their subjectivity through the site. Albrechtslund argues that examining online social networking in this vein develops research on the social and playful aspects of surveillance and reveals that surveillance is fundamentally social. (ibid.)

Similarly, Alice Marwick (2012) sees peer-to-peer monitoring as an integral part of social media use. She defines the activity of 'the ongoing eavesdropping, investigation, gossip and inquiry that constitutes information gathering by

people about their peers' as social surveillance. This type of surveillance is characteristically reciprocal and takes place between individuals (and not organizations or similar institutions). (ibid., p. 382.) Although both Albrechtslund and Marwick focus on social media sites in their analysis, similar participation and interactivity can be witnessed throughout digital culture. Web 2.0 encourages audience participation as the content of many sites 'is produced or made available as a result of participation by users themselves' (Bruno, 2012, p. 343; see also Andrejevic, 2007).

Mark Andrejevic (2005, 2007) analyses peer-to-peer surveillance in a wider context than social networking sites and defines lateral surveillance as monitoring which can target not only family and friends, but also casual acquaintances and romantic interests. He associates this phenomenon on the one hand with the increasing access of individuals to surveillance equipment, but on the other hand with entertainment. Lateral surveillance is 'a form of entertainment born of curiosity'. It is casual monitoring executed 'when whiling away the time online' (Andrejevic, 2007, p. 229), and as such it is not necessarily fundamentally different from participatory or social surveillance.

The fourth concept to analyse peer-to-peer surveillance is hijacked surveillance, introduced by Hille Koskela (2009, 2011a). She argues that surveillance in its current form is embedded in the everyday life of people in two ways: they are increasingly under control, but at the same time they are also increasingly active in producing control. The latter process is analysed as hijacking surveillance or 'amateur participation in surveillance', which can include, for instance, using webcams for private purposes, sending pictures taken with mobile phone cameras to the media, and various types of online-presentation of amateur pictures and videos. This type of participation can also include voluntary self-exposure, and thus surveillance can be experienced as an empowering, positive phenomenon. (Koskela, 2009a.)

## 2.1.2 RESPONSIBILIZED SURVEILLANCE

The types of peer-to-peer surveillance analysed in the section above focus mostly on positive aspects of participation, such as sociability and empowerment. However, peer-to-peer surveillance is not always analysed in such a context. Even though the kind of participation Web 2.0 and commercial media encourages has undoubtedly developed and changed information sharing, that same participation can be 'captured and capitalised on, whether it be to reinforce the logic of consumerism or feed surveillance processes' (Bruno, 2012, pp. 343–344.) Andrejevic (2007), for instance, argues that in the context of commerce and the media the promise of interactivity is actually covering how information is gathered 'in the service of top-down forms of political and economic control' (p. 213). Individuals, who as citizens or consumers were previously considered passive spectators, are now urged to turn into active participants, and the monitoring they are conducting is in fact an extension of the state's or commercial entities' power. In other words,

participating in surveillance can form into 'asymmetrical, nontransparent data gathering'. (Andrejevic, 2007, pp. 39–40, p. 162.)

Andrejevic's analysis on lateral surveillance and interactive culture is in close connection with surveillance connected to responsibilization and risk-talk (Garland, 2001; Rose, 2000). Responsibilization is a term used to describe and analyse the changed status of modern criminal policy in the UK and USA from the 1970s and 1980s, where governments increasingly began to understand crime control as being 'beyond the state' (Garland, 2001, p. 123). David Garland (2001) argues, that the most important change was 'the effort increasingly being made to reach out and enlist the activities of non-state actors, linking up the informal crime-control practices to the more formal activities of the police themselves' (p. 124). He terms this strategy a responsibilization strategy, where a single message is repeated: 'the state alone is not, and cannot be, responsible for preventing and controlling crime' (ibid., pp. 124–126). Thus, the ideal role of the state is recast, as it is argued that the state no longer should aim to guarantee and provide security but, should instead, 'be a partner, animator and facilitator for a variety of independent agents and powers' (Rose, 2000, pp. 323–324). This entails that 'individuals cannot look solely to the public police and the formal mechanisms of the legal system: they must actively engage in partnerships with expertise to maintain order and combat threats to individual and collective security' (ibid., p. 327).

Garland's analysis focuses on crime prevention policies and responsibilization as an extension of the state's control, whereas Andrejevic concentrates more on commercial entities and responsibilization policies related to consumption. However, the practices of responsibilization are quite similar. A responsibilization strategy 'aims to embed controls in the fabric of normal interaction, rather than suspend them above it in the form of a sovereign command' (Garland, 2001, p. 129). In this way, the state or commercial entity can work through society, not upon it (ibid., p. 140).

Responsibilized participation in surveillance differs from other types of peer-to-peer surveillance primarily in that it is asked for. This can happen online, where several Internet sites and applications 'invite users to monitor urban spaces so that they can report, or be informed about, incidents, crimes and suspicious situations or people' (Bruno, 212, p. 346), but it can also be connected to various types of everyday life monitoring from suspicious activity in public places to informing about accidents. The phenomenon can also be connected to a 'rising culture of informing' (Doyle, 2006), where 'individuals are encouraged and assumed to take positions previously held by authorities' (Koskela, 2011a, p. 56).

One of the pioneer online applications exploiting responsibilized surveillance was the *Texas Virtual Border Watch Program*. This was an Internet site launched in 2008 by the United States. The site showed real-time video feed from selected locations along the USA-Mexico border. Anyone anywhere in the world with an Internet connection could watch the feed and notify the Texas Border Sheriffs' coalition if they saw or suspected seeing

something suspicious going on along the border. No rewards for individual watchers were given. (Koskela, 2010.)

Daniel Trottier (2014) has examined similar examples of crime-related citizen monitoring of CCTV feeds in the UK and terms the practice crowdsourced surveillance. He argues, that by 'releasing CCTV feeds to a large crowd of users' the companies manage surveillance at minimal costs (Trottier, 2014, p. 610). Thus, 'participation is part of a business model' (ibid., 623). In the commercial context, the UK-based InternetEyes site, operating from 2010 to 2013, is an example of such business-based surveillance-related online responsibilization. [7] InternetEyes allowed registered viewers to watch 24/7 live feed from video surveillance cameras installed in shops and other InternetEyes client businesses, mainly in the UK. The feed from the locations was routed live to the site, which had a notification system for viewers' use. If the viewer saw or suspected seeing something illegal going on, she or he could with the notification system send out an alert to the owner of the camera. The most vigilant viewers received monetary compensation as a reward for their monitoring. In addition, the site included a system for giving points for accurate sightings, and a leaderboard where one could compare one's own performance with that of other users. InternetEyes combined the idea of responsibilization with the opportunity for private individuals to earn money, and the site was set up like an online game application.

The motives for participating in such surveillance can vary considerably. Indeed, the types of participation analysed in this and the previous section seem to be motivated by very different reasons. At one end, fear and preparing for risks may motivate some types of participation (such as monitoring suspicious activity in public places). At other end, these practices can be influenced by more playful motives (such as playing the 'InternetEyes' game). Like surveillance in general, it seems that participation in surveillance can also have two faces. But they are not necessarily those of care and control (Lyon, 2001, p. 3) but can, indeed, be more about fear and fun (Lyon, 2014, p. 74). In the following two subchapters I first analyse private surveillance practices and peer-to-peer surveillance in the context of fear, risk and discipline and second in the context of fun and pleasure.

## 2.2 SURVEILLANCE FRAMED BY FEAR, RISK AND DISCIPLINE

As argued above, responsibilization policies and practices are often connected to questions relating to fear and risk: responsibilization has been seen as a distinguishing feature of a 'climate of generalized risk'. This climate is characterized by 'a culture of detection and mutual monitoring'. (Andrejevic,

---

[7] The site operated at http://interneteyes.co.uk/. A similar site has recently been launched in Brazil at http://www.olhosdainternet.com.br/.

2005, p. 493; 2007, p. 38.) A similar term, used by Frank Furedi (1997), describes present-day society as a risk-saturated 'culture of fear'. In this culture safety is a fundamental value and risk is something that needs to be avoided.

One consequence of the increasing public emphasis on risk and fear is that people have become more 'security conscious' (cf. Garland, 2001, p. 161). Accordingly, surveillance technologies and their extensive use have become commonplace. Focus on public fears calls for more security, containing the 'danger', and identifying and managing any and all risks (ibid., p. 12), and surveillance technologies seem well suited for these purposes. Risk in present-day society is not only geared towards individuals but is generalized, which leads to participation being required at every level: beyond protecting oneself, risk and security-conscious people should also participate in shared control. Thus, fear and notions of risk can also be exploited by, for instance, the authorities, who can use the threat of risk as an incentive for people to participate in shared monitoring. (Andrejevic, 2007.)

Previous research pays some attention to analysing the individual participating in these shared practices. In particular, the security-conscious individual has been analysed as a 'diminished subject' (Furedi, 1997, p. 147), an 'insecurity subject' (Monahan, 2010, p. 23), and a 'humble servant' of the authorities (Koskela, 2011b, p. 276). Furedi (1997) applies the term diminished subject to describe the risk-conscious individual. He argues that in a climate of risk, individuals 'feel exposed and unsafe' and this experience makes them 'preoccupied with personal safety'. The continuous feelings of unsafety makes them ineffective, lowers their expectations and trust in themselves, and promotes the need for professional guidance. As a result, diminished subjects try to avoid unnecessary risks and play it safe. (Furedi, 1997.) [8] Torin Monahan (2010), on the other hand, argues that the ideal citizen of the present day is constructed as an insecurity subject, a person who 'anticipates risks, and minimizes them through consumption' (p. 2). Like the diminished subject, the 'insecurity subject is afraid but can effectively sublimate these fears by engaging in preparedness activities' (ibid., p. 23.) Koskela (2011b), for her part, analyses individuals participating in shared control by viewing them as humble servants of authoritarian control and as a workforce executing policies dictated from above. This view gives little credit to the autonomy of the participant, diminishing them to the role of 'employees' of the state. While all of these analyses on the individual in a risk-saturated climate see her or him as insecure and afraid, Monahan provides the subject with most autonomy and

---

[8] In a similar vein, John Gilliom (2001) concludes his excellent research on welfare mothers and welfare surveillance in Ohio, USA, by stating that the surveillance imposed upon mothers turns them into 'diminished people'. Such mothers are very aware of the constant surveillance imposed on them and while they might complain to their peers about their circumstances and about the excessive surveillance, at the same time they fear their caseworkers and the bureaucracy and rarely make any formal complaints as it might draw unwanted attention to them and further endanger their situation. (Gilliom, 2001.)

agency. The insecurity subject might be afraid, but at least she or he acts to sublimate those fears.

Individual participation in shared monitoring has also been analysed in the context of discipline. In fact, participation can affect the nature of discipline, as in peer-to-peer surveillance discipline is not merely an issue for the watched. Andrejevic (2007) has argued, that 'in an era of distributed surveillance, the amplification of panoptic monitoring relies on the internalized discipline not just of the watched, but also of the watchers' (p. 239). Making people participate in shared monitoring 'is itself a kind of government of them': a government which incites 'individuals to construe their lives according to' the very norms they themselves are enforcing. Thus, by participating in shared monitoring, the individual is also participating in the creation of her/himself as a subject of governing power. (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 187.)

## 2.3   SURVEILLANCE AS A PLAYFUL AND FUN PRACTICE

In the past decade, the idea of play in the context of surveillance has been increasingly emphasized as researchers have begun to understand that not all forms of surveillance should, or even can, be analysed in terms of risk, control or fear. Indeed, besides aiming to control or to influence, in some contexts surveillance can be considered to be positively protective, even playful and amusing practice. (Albrechtslund, 2008; Albrechtslund & Dubbeld, 2005; Ellerbrok, 2010; 2011; Koskela, 2004; McGrath, 2004.)

This line of thought originated from researchers such as John E. McGrath (2004) who, in *Loving Big Brother*, argued that it is possible to enjoy and even to desire surveillance; Koskela (2004) who, in her article 'Webcams, TV Shows and Mobile Phones', considered the playful uses of surveillance images; and Albrechtslund and Lynsey Dubbeld (2005) who, in their article 'The Plays and Arts of Surveillance', argued that surveillance can serve 'as a source of enjoyment, pleasure and fun' (p. 220). These enquiries analyse surveillance specifically in the context of performance (McGrath, 2004) and resistance (Koskela, 2004). Besides these issues, surveillance has been viewed from the perspective of empowerment (Ellerbrok, 2010; see also Albrechtslund & Nørgaard Glud, 2010; Koskela, 2004; Monahan, Phillips & Murakami Wood, 2010; Regan & Steeves, 2010) and using surveillance equipment for play (Ellerbrok, 2011). Each of these contexts are briefly examined below.

Surveillance, particularly camera surveillance, can be examined in the context of performance as surveillance is not only about watching, but can also be about being watched. Seeing and being seen connect to sociability, entertainment, and even pleasure. Indeed, some people long to be seen and to seek a more active part in producing visual representations. (Koskela, 2006; McGrath, 2004; see also Bruno, 2012.) Reality TV is an interesting example of

combining watching and being watched in a manner where both the participants and the viewers are active. Through constant camera monitoring of the participants in reality TV shows, the genre turns surveillance into 'a mediated spectacle' where the viewer is shown how much fun surveillance can be (Andrejevic, 2004, p. 2, p. 8). The participants in the shows become 'spectacles, observed, and controlled' (Weibel, 2002, p. 218). Reality TV promises that anyone can have 'a distant chance of becoming a star', at the same time it enables the viewers 'to participate in a medium that has long relegated audience members to the role of passive spectators' (Andrejevic, 2004, p. 2).

Performing before the camera can be sexual in nature, as 'people do flirt, and moreover tease, strip, and in countless other ways act sexually, while other people watch' (Bell, 2009, p. 204), but at the opposite end it can also be an argument against 'the ways in which society regulates individuals' and the ways in which 'shame keeps people meek and obedient' (Koskela, 2004, p. 207). This brings us to examining surveillance within the framework of resistance. Koskela (2004) argues that cameras which aim at increasing visibility can be interpreted in terms of turning surveillance into a spectacle, but they can also be seen as a form of confrontation and resistance. Merely by viewing a surveillance feed one cannot determine for certain the context in which the performance takes place (Koskela & Mäkinen, 2016).

Ariane Ellerbrok (2010) has done novel work in analysing private surveillance practices from viewpoints other than control, and she argues for the usefulness of the concept of empowerment when we aim to understand emerging surveillance technologies. Ellerbrok argues that empowerment could open new ways of understanding why people willingly use equipment which can also be analysed as exploitative. She acknowledges that discussing empowerment or disempowerment alone is insufficient: many technologies combine multiple levels of visibility where some levels might be considered empowering at the same time as others, often working 'under the radar', might be exploitative. (Ellerbrok, 2010.) Besides empowerment, Ellerbrok (2011) suggests we should consider the role of play as 'a driving logic' for the intensification of surveillance. She argues that the 'playful uses of an otherwise controversial technology have fundamentally altered both its popular representation and the ways in which it is taken up by the public'. As a consequence, playful uses of surveillance equipment can be connected to processes of obfuscating and normalizing surveillance. (Ellerbrok, 2011, pp. 529–530, p. 538.)

These different context where surveillance has been be analysed exemplify how it moves beyond issues of fear, risk and control towards being playful and even a fun activity. Understanding surveillance as a playful experience can stem on the one hand from analysing playful uses of surveillance equipment but on the other hand from analysing practices where surveillance is turned into or disguised as a game. In the latter context the purpose of surveillance is understood in terms of control, but the practice of surveillance is constructed

as a game. This process has often been termed gamification. It takes place on the borderline of games and real life, and researchers have defined it as 'the use of game design elements in non-game contexts' (Deterding, Khaled, Nacke, & Dixon, 2011) or as applying play to non-play spaces (Whitson, 2013, p. 166). In gamification, games are used 'for other purposes than their normal expected use for entertainment' (Deterding et al., 2011, p. 2). In the interface of gamification, Jaakko Stenros, Markus Montola and Frans Mäyrä (2007) discuss 'pervasive games', defining them as 'games that expand spatial, temporal and social boundaries of traditional games' (p. 30). These games blur the line between fact and fiction, encourage both serious and playful participation, fuse games with the thrill of the real and bring the fun of play into normal life. The above-mentioned InternetEyes site is a perfect example of such a game.

The playful side of monitoring others can be seen as paving the way for a 'surveillance culture', where surveillance is everywhere and is increasingly considered to be 'normal' (Lyon, 2014). Above, I have aimed to clarify some of the different contexts of surveillance research and to consider how these can be positioned between motives of fear and fun. The last subchapter, which follows, focuses on previous research on camera surveillance and webcams.

## 2.4  A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH ON CAMERA SURVEILLANCE

Previous research on camera surveillance has for the most part focused on public spaces and much of that research is from the UK. Surveillance cameras there were first introduced into the public transport and retail sector in the 1960s and 1970s, and then, from the 1980s onwards, increasingly also to (urban) public space. During the last two decades, camera surveillance has turned into a normal feature of British urban life. The exponential growth of camera surveillance in the 1990s was the result of determined governmental policies claiming that camera surveillance would increase public safety. (Norris, 2012a.)

In Finland, where the empirical data for this research was gathered, public space camera surveillance has become more common almost without anyone noticing (Koskela, 2009b). For the most part the change has managed to elude even researchers. A survey examining attitudes towards camera surveillance was conducted in Helsinki in 2003 (Koskela & Tuominen, 2003). Since then, camera surveillance in Finland has been touched upon in a few theses focusing on public spaces (e.g. Lindqvist, 2005; Mäkinen, 2010) and in some more specific case studies, for instance on traffic surveillance (Mäkinen, 2015) and work-place surveillance (Kuokkanen & Alvesalo-Kuusi, 2014; Ojala, 2010). When it comes to camera surveillance in more private space, such as domestic surveillance, even less research is available. To my knowledge, prior to this thesis domestic surveillance, particularly camera surveillance, has not been

researched in Finland. There is also very little international research on the topic (Michele Rapoport's 2012 article 'The Home Under Surveillance' is a noteworthy exception).

The Ministry of the Interior in Finland collects survey information biannually for the Police Barometer, where one of the questions concerns private surveillance systems. The most recent Police Barometer estimated that about 10% of Finns have some kind of an alarm system in their home (Vuorensyrjä & Fagerlund, 2016). However, this information is not specific with regard to the type of alarm system used. As technology develops and different devices are more readily available to the consumer, it is increasingly possible to use devices for purposes not originally intended. In the surveillance context this process has been termed 'surveillance creep' or 'control creep' (Innes, 2001). In brief, it means that 'devices and laws justified for one purpose find new applications not originally part of their mandate' (Haggerty & Ericson, 2006, p. 18). For instance, webcams can be used for domestic surveillance and monitoring as easily as surveillance cameras built for these purposes. Thus, it seems that the idea of 'camera surveillance' might also be in the process of changing.

Surveillance devices, practices and policies have developed in the past decades; in this chapter I have aimed to describe and analyze these changes. From this setting I explore mundane and private camera surveillance practices. I begin my investigation with an empirical examination of surveillance in the private framework; particularly focusing on how these practices are placed in relation to control and beyond it. The empirical examination is followed by a theoretical and conceptual analysis of the relations between control-related and playful surveillance practices, grounded in part on the empirical data and in part on prior research on the topic. The next chapters (3, 4 and 5) present the data and findings of my four research articles. These findings are discussed in chapter six in light of the themes from this chapter and the two main research questions posed in the introduction.

# 3   RESEARCH DATA AND METHODS

The objectives of this research are to analyse everyday life uses and experiences of surveillance equipment and to develop an understanding of surveillance as a practice moving between and beyond issues of fear, risk, individual preparedness and playfulness. The larger research problem of examining surveillance within the frameworks of control and play is approached through two main research questions in four separate research articles. Articles I and II are more tightly connected to the first main research question, which is more empirical in nature, whereas Articles III and IV focus on the second main research question, which is more theoretical in nature. The research questions are:

1.  To what extent can private surveillance practices be seen in terms of control, fear, preparedness towards individual risks and playfulness?
    a.  Why is (surveillance) camera equipment installed in private or semi-private premises?
    b.  How are these (surveillance) camera systems used? What type of surveillance is produced through them?
2.  How does surveillance as a control-related activity connect with game-like and playful practices?
    a.  How are private surveillance practices encouraged through turning surveillance into a game?
    b.  How can surveillance practices be analysed through games and play?

Articles I-III analyse private surveillance practices in four different but specific places: (1) homes, where surveillance systems were installed mainly for safety-related purposes (Articles I and II); (2) a boat club, where the camera system was installed for surveillance-related reasons (Article II); (3) a university students' recreation room, where the camera system was installed for playful and recreational reasons (Article II); and (4) shops and other business locations with surveillance camera systems sending out online data for volunteers to monitor for crime prevention purposes (Article III). Article IV focuses on practices which are not dependent on location.

The main body of the empirical data is comprised of interviews (N:23) collected in Finland: two articles (I and II) are based on this data. In addition, this thesis utilizes a case study approach with the focus on a specific online surveillance application (Article III), and a theoretical research approach with several illustrative examples on virtual and urban surroundings (Article IV). Table 2 summarizes the topic, data, type of analysis, and research question in all four articles.

*Table 2 Summarizing the topic, data and approach of Articles I-IV*

| Article | Topic | Data | Approach / Methods | Research questions |
|---------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------------|
| I Surveillance ON/OFF | Home surveillance systems | Interviews with home surveillance system users (N:13) | Empirical / Qualitative content analysis | 1, 1a, 1b |
| II Examination of online cameras | Online cameras | Interviews with student camera users, boat club camera users, and home surveillance camera users (N:15) | Empirical / Qualitative content analysis | 1, 1a, 1b |
| III Surveillance as a Reality Game | Gamification of responsibilized surveillance | Documents concerning InternetEyes: the site, its Facebook page, newsletters and personal communications, news coverage | Case study / Document review | 2, 2a |
| IV Ludic encounters | Surveillance theory through the lens of play | Previous research, illustrative examples | Theoretical | 2, 2b |

This thesis combines empirical and theoretical approaches in several ways. Two of the articles are grounded on empirical data, while two utilize a more theoretical and conceptual approach. Empirical data are used both as the foundation in forming theoretical categories and types and to help tease out potential trends in online watching. The results aim to reach beyond the specific data to participate in wider theoretical discussions on surveillance: one aim is to offer new tools for theoretical analysis of surveillance practices and places.

In addition to combining empirical and theoretical approaches, this research is both descriptive and exploratory. Descriptive studies aim to provide a thorough picture of a phenomenon. However, describing the phenomenon does not comprise merely 'stating the facts' but should include 'the context of action, the intentions of the actor, and the process in which action is embedded' (Dey, 1993, pp. 30–31). Whilst descriptions might 'lay the basis for analysis', in order 'to interpret, to understand and to explain' one needs to move beyond them (Gray, 2004, p. 327). In exploratory studies the aim is to explore a previously unknown phenomenon in detail. As little is still known about ordinary patterns of surveillance, both describing and analysing these practices is essential.

The analysis is built on these combinations of the empirical and theoretical approach and the descriptive and exploratory approach. Qualitative data analysis was conducted relying on three related processes: describing the

phenomenon, classifying it, and seeing how the classifications connect (see Dey, 1993: 30–31). These processes are overlapping and connect to theory-building as 'all types of qualitative research are descriptive to a certain extent, and all of them – being scientific work – contribute to theory' (Tesch 1991: 22).

Interview data and methods of analysis are presented below (3.1), followed by a brief summary of the case study design (3.2), and the theoretical research method (3.3). The last subchapter (3.4) considers the validity and reliability of the data and its analysis as a whole. The results of each article are discussed in chapters four and five.

## 3.1 INTERVIEW DATA

Interviewing is probably the most commonly used method for information gathering in qualitative research. The aim of qualitative interviewing is to acquire rich and detailed answers. Interviews are seen to be particularly useful when the research objectives are largely exploratory. (On interviewing, see e.g. Bryman, 2001; Gray, 2004; May, 1993.) This research includes altogether 23 semi-structured interviews collected in Finland during 2011 and 2014. All interviews were conducted using similar question forms (see Appendices). The order of the questions varied in some interviews depending on the answers. Furthermore, questions were extended or elaboration was asked if answers seemed vague.

The interview data is divided into three subsets, which are presented in the sections below. For the sake of clarity, all interviewees are also listed in Table 3 (page 24). In Articles I and II a few interviewees were referred to with different numbers. This is clarified in Table 3, which lists all interviewee numbers. After describing data sets in detail (sections 3.1.1–3.1.3), this subchapter moves on to explain how the analysis was made (section 3.1.4).

### 3.1.1 STUDENT CLUB CAMERA USERS

The first data set consists of five interviews with university students whose student organization's club room on campus (in the Helsinki metropolitan area) was equipped with a camera system. The student organization's club room included a living room, a lavatory, a locked storage room and a small kitchen. This space (not including the storage room) was publicly accessible during daytime hours when the university building was open. When the building was closed, students could access it with their own keys given by the university.

The club's camera system was designed and installed by the students themselves and comprised three cameras altogether: two filmed the living room and one filmed a shared coffeemaker in the kitchen. The cameras sent intermittent feed uploading every 15 seconds online to the student organization's webpage for public viewing. The feed was not restricted or

password-protected: anyone could access it at anytime. The feed was automatically recorded, but the archive was not public.

Five face-to-face interviews with students were conducted in 2011. The interviewees were between the ages of 23 and 35, with an average age of 28. One of the interviewees was female, four were men. They were mostly recruited through the board of the student organization. Two were recruited through snowball sampling (see e.g. Schutt, 2006, p. 157; Gray, 2004, p. 88). The interviews were recorded and transcribed: on average, one interview lasted 31 minutes. Altogether the interviews lasted 2 hours 32 minutes and the transcribed data is 48 pages in total.

Interviewees were asked about three themes: (1) Using the club room (i.e. what happened there and when), (2) Installing and using the camera system (i.e. who decided on installing it, why was it installed, what was it used for and how), and (3) Cameras in surveillance context (i.e. how was the place surveilled and how did the interviewee understand their system in terms of surveillance). These five interviews were analysed in Article II.

### 3.1.2   BOAT CLUB CAMERA USERS

The second data set consists of five interviews with people belonging to a Helsinki- based boat club which had installed a camera system on its premises. The boat club's outdoor premises included three piers, a loading dock and during the winter two parking areas for the boats. The premises were meant for members only: for a yearly fee they could keep their boat there, overhaul it and spend time in their boat and at the pier.

The club's outdoor camera system comprised two cameras (one movable, one fixed) filming the premises. The cameras were installed following a decision of the club's board to provide the members with 'an eye on the shore'. The cameras were located on top of high poles to ensure the widest possible visibility throughout the premises. The feed from the cameras was routed online and could be accessed through the boat club's webpage. The feed was password-protected: all members of the club used the same username and password. Cameras sent livestream, which was automatically recorded and could be accessed by the members.

Five face-to-face interviews were conducted in 2011. Interviewees were between the ages of 33 and 52, with an average age of 40. All were male. They were mostly recruited through the board of the boat club, which had only male members. One was recruited through shared friends. The interviews were recorded and transcribed: on average one interview lasted 58 minutes. Altogether, the interviews lasted 4 hours 48 minutes and the transcribed data is 75 pages in total.

Interviewees were asked about three themes: (1) Their own boating history and history within this particular club (i.e. how long had they had a boat, what was this boat club like and how did it differ from other clubs), (2) Securing and guarding the premises (i.e. how were the boats secured, what role

did the cameras play in general security, how were the cameras used), and (3) Perceptions on cameras and surveillance in general (i.e. how were the cameras perceived by the interviewees, did they influence the interviewees' behaviour, who were they meant for, who was watching the feed). These five interviews were analysed in Article II.

### 3.1.3   HOME SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM USERS

The third data set consists of altogether thirteen interviews with people who had installed surveillance systems in their homes or, in two cases, their secondary place of residence. These interviews were collected in 2014. Interviewees were between the ages of 36 and 70, with an average age of 58. Five of the interviewees were female, eight were male. Eight of them were from the greater Helsinki metropolitan area, five lived in other parts of Finland.

Six of these interviewees had a surveillance system based on access-control in their homes. Four of them lived in detached houses, two in row houses. Their systems included multiple intruder detection methods, such as infrared detectors and motion sensors. Most of these interviewees had a system which included various access-control measures and a camera which was connected to a security company. The company could access the camera in the case of an alarm, but the occupants themselves could not access it at any time. If an alarm was set off, the company's representatives would first try to reach the residents by phone, and if they could not be reached, security guards would go to the house.

Besides these six interviewees, seven people in total had varying types of systems based mainly on camera surveillance in their homes, or in two cases their secondary place of residence. Four of those with a home camera surveillance system lived in detached houses; one lived in an apartment building. The main difference with the previous six interviewees is that these systems had one or multiple cameras that the residents themselves could view online or through mobile applications and the feed from the cameras was not routed to a security company. Most of these people had a system which included one constantly filming and recording camera which could be accessed by the resident online at any time. Additionally, the most common system among these interviewees included a motion detector which, if set off, alerted the resident's mobile phone.

Even though the difference between access-control systems and camera systems was quite large, there were significant similarities in the ways all the thirteen interviewees justified installing surveillance in their homes and how they described their attitudes towards it. Furthermore, for some of the interviewees with an access-control system it was not clear who could watch the camera feed from their homes and whether or not they could watch it themselves. For these reasons all thirteen interviews are analysed in Article I when considering the reasons for installing these systems.

However, for the most part, the analysis and results derived from this data set (in Articles I and II) are based on interviews with camera surveillance system users. This means that the focus is on the group of seven people who had a system based on camera surveillance either in their homes or secondary residence (Article I) or on the group of five people who had a system based on camera surveillance in their homes (Article II). The focus is on camera system users because these systems offer more potential uses than access-control systems do. Also, by focusing on them, different data sets can be better compared (as the other two data sets examine the uses of camera systems).

These thirteen interviewees were recruited in three ways: through shared friends, from an online forum discussing surveillance cameras; and through snowball sampling (see e.g. Gray, 2004, p. 88; Schutt, 2006, p. 157). Interviews were conducted one-on-one, except for two couples whom I met together as it was convenient for them [these interviewees were no. 2(I) together with no. 3(I), and no. 4(I) together with no. 5(I); see Table 3]. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face in a place suggested by the interviewee; four were conducted on the phone because of the distance or by request of the interviewee. The interviews conducted on the phone did not differ from the face-to-face interviews with regard to the questions asked. However, they were in general a bit shorter than face-to-face interviews were, as on average a telephone interview lasted only 39 minutes whereas on average all interviews lasted 45 minutes. The recorded interviews were conducted in Finnish and then transcribed. Altogether, the interviews lasted 8 hours 17 minutes and the transcribed data is 117 pages in total.

All thirteen interviews covered three main themes: (1) Home (or the secondary residence) and neighbourhood (i.e. what was the residence like, who lived there, what was the neighbourhood like), (2) Surveillance system (i.e. what kind of a system did they have, how and why was it installed and how was it used), and (3) Feelings toward surveillance in home and in general. These thirteen interviews were analysed in Article I. Furthermore, five of these interviews (i.e. five interviews with people who had a camera system at their home) were analysed in Article II. Table 3 clarifies which interviews were used in which article.

*Table 3 Age, sex, and interviewee number of all interviewees*

| Interviewee group | | Sex | Age | Interviewee no. (Article no.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student club camera users (First data set) | | Woman | 23 | 1 (II) |
| | | Man | 23 | 2 (II) |
| | | Man | 33 | 3 (II) |
| | | Man | 26 | 4 (II) |
| | | Man | 35 | 5 (II) |
| Boat club camera users (Second data set) | | Man | 33 | 6 (II) |
| | | Man | 37 | 7 (II) |
| | | Man | 41 | 8 (II) |
| | | Man | 35 | 9 (II) |
| | | Man | 52 | 10 (II) |
| Home surveillance systems users (Third data set) | Home camera users | Woman | 59 | 1 (I), 11 (II) |
| | | Man | 68 | 9 (I), 12 (II) |
| | | Man | 36 | 10 (I), 13 (II) |
| | | Woman | 64 | 11 (I), 14 (II) |
| | | Man | 51 | 12 (I), 15 (II) |
| | Secondary residence camera users | Man | 57 | 8 (I) |
| | | Man | 70 | 13 (I) |
| | Access control system users | Man | 64 | 2 (I) |
| | | Woman | 64 | 3 (I) |
| | | Woman | 58 | 4 (I) |
| | | Man | 62 | 5 (I) |
| | | Man | 44 | 6 (I) |
| | | Woman | 60 | 7 (I) |

### 3.1.4 ANALYSING INTERVIEW DATA

Interviews were analysed through qualitative content analysis, which involves making interpretations of data through systematic and objective identification of special characteristics, for instance classes or categories (see Gray, 2004, p. 328). Categorizing data is a crucial part of the analysis as interpretations and explanations are built upon the categories created (Dey, 1993, p. 40). In practice, the interview data was searched for recurrent themes with coding frames, i.e. the questions used to approach the data. These themes were then turned into different categories. (See e.g. Bauer, 2000, p. 139; Marvasti, 2004, p. 94; Wilkinson, 2004, p. 183.)

In Article I the coding frames included the questions: 'Why were these devices purchased?', 'How were they used?', and 'What kind of feelings did people describe in relation to them and to surveillance in general?'. Analysis began by categorizing data within the frames of acquiring the systems (why did the interviewees have them), using them (what have interviewees seen through the cameras), and understanding surveillance at home and in general

(how did interviewees describe having surveillance at home; did they think their system had changed their perceptions towards surveillance). The first category was further divided to include answers on how interviewees described their feelings about safety (in relation to their system), about how they used their system for deterrence, and about how they used it to catch potential perpetrators. The analysis in Article I is built on these frames.

In Article II data coding was built on the question 'How were these systems used?'. The analysis began by coding all uses described by the interviewees which related to control. After that, remaining uses were examined in more detail and three new categories were created: entertaining uses, other ways of being active with the cameras, and, finally, 'being in the space' through the cameras.

Data analysis was made with Atlas.ti. After categories were identified, they were analysed through selecting excerpts concerning each category, summarizing and paraphrasing relevant sections to clarify context and identifying and describing key features in more detail (see Gray, 2004, pp. 328–329; Marvasti, 2004, p. 94). Ian Dey (1993, pp. 96–97) eloquently summarizes the challenges of creating qualitative categories:

> *Creating categories is both a conceptual and empirical challenge; categories must be 'grounded' conceptually and empirically. That means they must relate to an appropriate analytic context, and be rooted in relevant empirical material. Categories which seem fine 'in theory' are no good if they do not fit the data. Categories which do fit the data are no good if they cannot relate to a wider conceptual context. We could say that categories must have two aspects, an internal aspect – they must be meaningful in relation to the data – and an external aspect – they must be meaningful in relation to the other categories.*

The qualitative data analysis in this research aimed to meet these challenges. The main goal was to gain insight into the practices of watching as described by people themselves. However, the analysis aimed beyond describing those practices to forming categories of surveillance based upon them, categories which could potentially be used in future research on private surveillance practices. Thus, the categories created related both to the empirical data of this research but also to previous research on surveillance. Furthermore, analysis followed the three processes of qualitative research (Dey, 1993): interviews were used for acquiring information and describing the phenomenon; categories which were created were based on interviews; and categories were compared to each other and to previous literature so that they could potentially be used as analytical tools in future research on participation in surveillance. The last subchapter (3.4) returns to the limits of this research design by critically examining the empirical data and analysis presented here.

## 3.2   INTERNETEYES SITE AS A CASE STUDY

While Articles I and II were grounded on interview data, Article III is a case study which focuses on the InternetEyes website. The empirical evidence upon which this case study builds on comprises the InternetEyes site itself, its Facebook page, and other documentation and archival records concerning the site, including the site's newsletters for members from September 2011 to February 2013 (altogether 10 newsletters) and personal communications with one of the directors of the company (altogether 8 messages during October 2012). Some of the available media coverage concerning the site is also summarized in the article in order to place the site in context.

The InternetEyes site operated between 2010 and 2013 and it enabled viewers to monitor 24/7 live feed from video surveillance cameras installed in shops and other InternetEyes client businesses, mainly located in the UK. Viewers from the EU, the EEA, or other selected countries could register as users. When logging in to the site they saw a randomly chosen camera feed set-up from four different locations. The feed was equipped with an alert function. If viewers saw or suspected they saw something illegal going on, they could notify the owner of the camera, who then decided how to react. The site included a points system where accurate sightings were rewarded with points. Ten points were given for correct sightings. One point was given if the owner of the camera believed the viewer acted in good faith but no theft or such like could be witnessed. Two points were lost if there was no reason for sending the alert or if the owner of the camera suspected that the viewer was acting maliciously. Each month the most vigilant viewers were rewarded with at least £1000. Furthermore, monetary compensation was also given for extensive watching. Besides monetary compensation, viewers could compare their own points and ranking to others on a leaderboard.

The InternetEyes site is the main focus of the case study in Article III. Case studies, in general, are empirical inquiries which investigate 'contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident' (Yin, 2009, p. 18). As a research approach they are needed when the aim is to 'understand complex social phenomena' (ibid., p. 4). The case study approach is specifically useful when the aim is to 'uncover a relationship between a phenomenon and the context in which it is occurring' (Gray, 2004, pp. 123–124). In terms of the InternetEyes site, Article III analysed it in contexts of peer-to-peer surveillance, responsibilized surveillance, and gamified surveillance practices. The analysis was grounded on a thorough description of the site's functions.

## 3.3  THEORETICAL RESEARCH DESIGN

Moving forward with more theory-based approaches, Article IV is theoretical in design and contains no specific empirical data from which results are drawn. Instead it uses illustrative examples from online and offline spaces to elaborate its arguments. The arguments made are built on theorizing which aims to 'understand and explain something that happens in society' (Svedberg, 2012, p. 14). Richard Svedberg (2012) sees theorizing as a 'craft' where the point is to 'say something new' about a phenomenon (p. 11). Theorizing can take place in several ways, including for instance, naming, conceptualizing, model-building, and using metaphors (ibid.).

Indeed, metaphors have been argued to be 'a highly significant, if as yet undertheorized, aspect of sociological analysis' (Silber, 1995, p. 325; see also DiCicco-Bloom & Gibson, 2010). Donald A Schön (1979) has argued that metaphors can be understood both as a perspective and 'a process by which new perspectives on the world come to existence' (Schön, 1979, p. 254). [9] The key idea of a metaphor 'is to compare what is being researched to something else' (Svedberg, 2012, p. 23). This allows new perspectives on the original issue. The most memorable metaphors use language appropriate to one domain 'as a lens for seeing' another domain and as such metaphors can 'bring two separate domains into cognitive and emotional relation' (Svedberg, 2012, p. 23; cites Black, 1962, pp. 236–237).

Social sciences and their theory have been affected by metaphors borrowed from other fields (for this discussion, see e.g. DiCicco-Bloom & Gibson, 2010; Silber, 1995). In Surveillance Studies metaphors, such as the Panopticon and Big Brother, [10] have been central tools in reflecting different surveillance practices. Multiple new metaphors for surveillance analysis have been suggested, but they mostly build on the existing ones, particularly the panopticon, rather than standing on their own. [11] The noteworthy exception in newer metaphorical surveillance analysis is 'the surveillant assemblage' coined by Kevin D. Haggerty and Richard V. Ericson (2000). The assemblage metaphor recognizes emergent surveillance systems as rhizomatic structures

---

[9] On the latter point, Schön (1979) discusses 'generative metaphors', which are metaphors able to generate 'new perceptions, explanations, and inventions'. As an example of a generative metaphor, Schön describes a process where a group of technicians were developing a new paintbrush. One of them noticed how a paintbrush is not only 'a brush' but also, in a way, 'a pump'. Using the metaphor of a pump led to the group noticing 'new features of the brush and of the painting process'. As a consequence, they were able to develop a better new paintbrush. Thus, using metaphors enabled them not only to see things differently, but to do them differently. (Schön, 1979, pp. 258–259.)

[10] The Big Brother metaphor comes from George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), set in a fictional totalitarian state Oceania, where the 'thought police' monitor every aspect of the citizens' lives under the direction of Big Brother, a (symbolic) figurehead of the Party.

[11] Examples of such metaphors are, for instance, 'the ban-opticon' coined by Didier Bigo (2006) and 'the synopticon' analysed by Thomas Mathiesen (1997) (Haggerty, 2006, p. 26).

in which once discreet surveillance systems are now increasingly linked. Haggerty and Ericson argue, that as a consequence of such linking people no longer have the possibility to disappear from surveillance. (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000.)

One challenge in using metaphors is that they are sometimes conceptually confused with analogies. [12] For instance, Benjamin DiCicco-Bloom and David R. Gibson (2010) seem to use the two concepts as synonyms, although they do note that 'the term "analogy" is sometimes preferred to "metaphor" to reflect the fact that the comparison is between sets of relations rather than elements' (p. 249). Svedberg (2012), on the other hand, separates analogies and metaphors by arguing that while they are similar, analogies are 'less radical' (p. 23). Silber (1995) notes that 'the relation between analogy and metaphors is itself a complicated issue: a component of analogy is often considered a part of metaphorical thinking' (pp. 350–351).

In Article IV surveillance practices and surveillant places are theorized by using vocabulary borrowed from the sphere of play and games. The surveillance game (or surveillance play) metaphors we analyse and develop in Article IV were introduced already in Article III. These five metaphors include (1) cat-and-mouse, (2) hide-and-seek, (3) labyrinth, (4) sleight-of-hand, and (5) poker. These metaphors are used to examine how playful and control-related practices can take place simultaneously in surveillance contexts. Furthermore, they aim to illustrate how control-related surveillance practices could be analysed from a ludic approach. The content of these metaphors is discussed in subchapter 5.2. Developing them is still considered a work in progress.

## 3.4   CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON DATA AND ANALYSIS

The major part of the empirical data collected for this research is comprised of interviews. Before moving forward, a few issues need to be addressed regarding the selection of cases and interviewees and the activities described by those interviewed. The first issue is why these three cases were chosen and what consequences the relatively small size of the data sets has. These three cases were selected as the purpose was to examine online camera uses in different types of settings. As the camera systems in the three examined places differed from each other either concerning the reasons for installing them or

---

[12] The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a metaphor as 'A figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to an object or action to which it is not literally applicable; a thing regarded as representative or symbolic of something else' (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/metaphor). Analogy, on the other hand, is defined as 'A comparison between one thing and another, typically for the purpose of explanation or clarification; a correspondence or partial similarity; a thing which is comparable to something else in significant respects; a process of arguing from similarity in known respects to similarity in other respects' (https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/analogy).

concerning the ways the feed was secured, these cases form an interesting whole for examining varying usages. The challenge in this examination, however, is that the separate interview sets are quite small, with only five interviews with two of them. Furthermore, there was a three-year time gap between conducting interviews with domestic surveillance systems users in comparison to the two other data sets. This raises some additional questions on the comparability and generalizability of these results.

When it comes to these challenges it should be noted that while the individual data sets were quite small in themselves, the overall interview data size is 23 participants. Both of the two empirical articles (I and II) are based on a larger sample of the interviewees (13 or 15 interviews) than only one data set. Thus, neither of the two smaller data sets are analysed alone but are always compared with other interview data sets. Furthermore, it is not argued that the uses discovered here would be limited to those if investigations with similar online camera systems were made elsewhere. The argument is that within these systems the said uses were recognized and that perhaps those uses could imply some potential trends in online watching. Moreover, the uses recognized do connect on many levels to previous research on similar themes, which gives them further support.

The time gap between collecting different data sets can also have an effect on the results received, particularly regarding interviewees' perceptions of surveillance in general, as there have been many globally noted surveillance events during those years. However, it is difficult to distinguish the significance of these events to the interviewees as the places where interviewees conducted surveillance were also remarkably different in 2011 and 2014. The interviews conducted in 2014 focused on home surveillance system users, and any unease regarding surveillance technology at home might be connected to the nature of the home as a private place rather than due to global surveillance events.

The second issue to consider is the interviewees: Who were they and how were they recruited? Particular attention should be given to the age and sex differences in the data sets. In all three sets the majority of the interviewees were male. There are three explanations for this bias: (1) the students were studying in a male-dominated field, (2) the board of the boat club (from where most of the interviewees were recruited) was all-male, and (3) most of the discussants in the thread discussing home surveillance systems (where five of the home camera user interviewees were recruited) were male. The smaller ratio of female interviewees in all subsets reflects these issues. As gender can affect the perceptions and experiences of surveillance, some views of female interviewees in relation to, for instance, fear were taken into special consideration in the analysis made in Article I.

Similarly, the average age of the interviewees varies in the three sets. The average age is quite low in the first data set (student camera users) and quite high in the third set (home surveillance system users). As age can potentially affect the activities and perceptions of interviewees concerning the

investigated issues, it is considered separately, albeit briefy, in the analysis in Article I. However, as with the sex differences, it is not taken into consideration in Article II. In terms of religion, ethnicity, class, status, or such, Finnish people are quite homogeneous, and for this reason these issues were not considered in the analysis.

Beyond age and sex differences, the manner in which interviewees were recruited might affect the replies received and thus should be considered here. For instance, most of the home camera surveillance system users were recruited through an online forum focusing on surveillance systems. These participants are likely to be more interested in their devices and perhaps even use them more actively than other people owning these systems. Similarly, boat club members and students were mainly recruited through the boards' of both organizations and as they were active in these clubs, they were likely to be more aware of the systems and possibly used them more actively than other members. However, this could prove beneficial as one of the aims was to find the multiple ways in which these systems are used. Thus, it might prove more valuable to interview people who use their systems actively than people who do not.

The third issue to consider is the sensitivity of the research topic and the nature and dynamics of the interviews as 'social events'. Surveillance, particularly when implemented at home, might be a sensitive issue to some of the informants. In particular, they might not want to reveal the more negative aspects of using these systems. Furthermore, the nature of the activities described in the interviews might be influenced by the interview situation itself. This concern relates to the validity of the responses. One way to ensure the authenticity of the replies is to attempt to establish a rapport with the interviewees (see e.g. Baker, 2004, p. 162: Miller & Glassner, 2004, pp. 127–128). As an interviewer I aimed to create an atmosphere in which the interviewees felt they could describe their feelings and actions without me questioning or challenging them. I also encouraged them to choose a time and place for the interview that was most convenient for them, and emphasized the confidentiality of everything told. My estimation based on the interview situations and the dialogue between myself and those interviewed is that the interviewees described their true feelings about their surveillance systems and that how they actually use their system is comparable to how they explained their uses to me.

This last issue also connects to the ethicality of this research. The main principles of research ethics include ensuring voluntary participation, protecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants, and considering the potential benefits to them (see e.g. Marvasti, 2004, p. 135). The participants of this research participated voluntarily and did not receive monetary compensation for their efforts. Confidentiality of the participants usually implies that no one besides the researcher 'will know the identity of' the subjects (ibid., p. 138). I aimed at this by not revealing the location of the boat club, or the university where the interviews were collected. Furthermore,

I did not reveal in detail where the home surveillance system users lived, and this was also requested by many interviewees. However, it is possible that those few interviewees who were recruited through shared acquaintances might be recognized by those mutual friends. This is an issue I should have considered in more detail before recruiting the interviewees in this manner. However, it is also an issue all the interviewees were aware of (as they knew how I had acquired their contact details and often they had already spoken with our shared acquaintances about participating). Finally, even though no monetary compensation was given to the respondents, this research can benefit them at least in three ways (see also Marvasti, 2004, p. 139): it can 'help increase awareness and stimulate debate', 'make people more aware of their choices', and help 'provide "new perspectives"' on these issues.

Besides examining the limits of the data and considering research ethics, the analysis itself should also be critically examined. In terms of generalizability, using qualitative data as a basis for theory building and conceptual and categorical analysis can be a difficult task as one should be careful about making generalizations when combining relatively small samples (such as small and specific interview sets) with large themes (such as surveillance, control, and play). (On this difficulty, see Gilliom, 2001, pp. 118–119.) This challenge presents itself particularly with the interview data. This thesis grounds many of its arguments on findings made from the interview data and suggests that some of the uses found in that data could be witnessed in other similar systems. However, this research does not exclude the existence of other potential ways of using these systems. [13] Furthermore, my theorizing of private surveillance practices builds both upon previous research and the empirical data I gathered. Thus, these results also connect to and gain strength from previous research on surveillance practices.

In critically reflecting on the data and analysis, this subchapter has aimed to recognize and resolve some of the limitations of this work. However, despite these limitations I argue that the kind of in-depth information received by interviewing surveillance system users about their experiences, and the analysis where classifications created are based both on interviews and previous research, could not have been possible by other than qualitative methods. Combining qualitative data analysis with theorizing and theory building allows one to make suggestions for future surveillance analysis. Furthermore, setting research questions between two research frameworks and aiming to move between and beyond them guarantees that these practices can be explored in all their richness.

In the following chapters I first present the empirical findings from Articles I and II, which focused on the first main research question and specifically the

---

[13] For instance, in the data on home surveillance system users, none of the interviewees described utilizing their cameras to monitor and care for their parents or other elderly or handicapped family members. However, this type of 'care' has been recognized in previous research which suggests these systems can be used as replacements for human caregivers at home (Rapoport, 2012, p. 324).

two subordinate questions: why are these equipment installed, and how are they used? Second, I present theoretical analysis from Articles III and IV, particularly focusing on the second main research question: how are private surveillance practices encouraged through gamification and how, on a more general level, could analysis on surveillance practices benefit from vocabularies of games and play? The findings are further discussed in chapter six, the concluding chapter of this summary article.

# 4 EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the empirical findings of Articles I and II. Empirical data on private camera surveillance practices were gathered in three quite different places: homes, a boat club and a student club. In all three places the camera equipment was used by private people. However, the reasons for installing this equipment were slightly different. Installing domestic surveillance systems aimed primarily at preventing and deterring crime and protecting the home. The installation of boat club cameras was also considered important in terms of deterrence, but in addition that system was planned to aid other practical needs of the club members. Student club camera equipment was installed for spontaneous and playful reasons: it was not originally intended for surveillance or deterrence. These installation reasons are examined in more detail below in subchapter 4.1, which focuses on answering the first subordinate research question. Subchapter 4.2 summarizes the results from Articles I and II by focusing on the second subordinate research question: how were these camera systems used and what type of surveillance was produced through them?

## 4.1 INSTALLING CAMERA SYSTEMS

Grounded on the interview data on home surveillance system users (N:13), domestic surveillance systems (including both camera systems and access-control systems) were installed for a variety of reasons, but the primary reason was to protect the home from unwanted visitors. Interviewees believed their system deterred potential intruders. If their home was broken into, they believed the police would be more likely to catch the perpetrators with the help of their surveillance system. Furthermore, the system allowed the residents to check that everything at home was as it should be even when they themselves could not be physically there. Thus, the system enabled the residents to maintain contact with their homes from a distance. These were the most important reasons for installing domestic surveillance devices. In addition, many interviewees with domestic surveillance systems were interested in the latest technology and were keen on experimenting with new gadgets, and this motivated them to acquire such systems in the first place. Marketing also affected decision making, as some interviewees stated they might not have acquired a domestic surveillance system had it not been marketed to them so vigorously. (For more detail, see Article I.)

Boat club cameras were installed for partly similar reasons. The main purpose of the boat club camera system was to prevent crime and vandalism and to provide the members with a view of the dock area and their own boat. Boat club cameras enabled the interviewees (N:5) to maintain contact with

their property from a distance. One main purpose for installing boat club cameras was that the members could watch the feed from the cameras instead of driving down to the dock: watching could give them the assurance that everything was all right. Besides protecting their boats from crime, through the cameras they could make sure their boats had not suffered any damage, for instance due to heavy wind. The cameras were also considered a deterrent and some interviewees believed the cameras or the warning signs prevented unwanted access to the area and/or unwanted behaviour there. (For more detail, see Article II.)

The reasons for installing the student club cameras differed from domestic systems and boat club cameras as students installed their cameras mainly to experiment with the technology, to see what could be done with it, and to pass the time. According to the interviewees (N:5), there was no specific reasoning, surveillance-related or other, behind the installation. Putting these cameras in place was not carefully considered but happened more spontaneously. (See also Article II.)

These installation reasons, particularly concerning domestic and boat club cameras, resonate with previous research which recognizes how surveillance systems are put in place to ensure protection and 'safeguard a sense of physical and mental well-being' (Rapoport, 2012, p. 328). However, they widen the view on installing camera devices as they also recognize reasons related to marketing, convenience and enthusiasm for experimenting with technology. While there were variations in the reasons for installing these devices, and the kinds of use were emphasized differently in different systems (this is examined in more detail below), if searching for similarities there were interviewees in all data sets who considered their systems in the context of deterring crime and unwanted behaviour. Deterrence was connected either to the signs warning about the system (particularly in homes and the boat club) or the noticeable locations of the cameras (particularly in the boat club and the student club [14]). However, as deterrence relates to the existence of the systems or the signs more than the concrete uses of the cameras, it is not considered at length in the following discussion, which focuses on the practices of use.

## 4.2 USING CAMERA SYSTEMS

### 4.2.1 FIVE TYPES OF DOMESTIC SURVEILLANCE

Article I analyses the uses of domestic surveillance systems. Empirical data consist of both access-control based system users (N:6) and camera system users (N:7). Interviews with different kinds of systems users were analysed

[14] There were no signs warning about the student club cameras, but many interviewees believed that the physical existence of the cameras worked as a deterrent: they explained that nothing had ever been stolen from their club room because they had the 'surveillance cameras' there.

concurrently when considering the reasons for installing the systems. When analysing uses, the focus was on camera system users. The core finding of the article is that five types of surveillance are produced with domestic camera systems: controlling, caring, recreational, communicational and sincere surveillance. They are briefly discussed below, and in more detail in Article I.

The primary aim of domestic surveillance systems was to protect the home from unwanted visitors. If someone with possible criminal intent entered the house, interviewees believed it would be possible to acquire an accurate picture from the surveillance system for the police to use, hopefully to identify and apprehend the suspect. This type of surveillance which aims to ensure that no unwanted persons are on the premises is termed *controlling surveillance*. As none of the interviewees' home or secondary residence had been burglarized before or after installing the system, control-related monitoring formed only a part of all the uses. Besides control, the cameras were also used for care-related watching, which targeted family members and domestic animals. Care focused particularly on children who were home alone or sleeping babies. In the latter situation the cameras were used as baby monitors. When adult family members were monitored it was usually justified by them doing something potentially dangerous, such as chopping wood. The watchers wanted to make sure they had not hurt themselves. This second type of surveillance is termed *caring surveillance*. These two types are almost self-evident, as 'to surveil' means to watch over or guard something: surveillance can entail both care and control activities and the same processes of 'watching over' can both enable and constrain (see also Lyon, 2001, p. 3; Bogard, 2006, p. 98).

Occasionally, the cameras were also used to entertain the viewer. This type of watching, which is termed *recreational surveillance*, focused for instance on weather, wild life and the natural environment surrounding the premises monitored. The aim of recreational watching was to pass time, a type of watching which was more playful in nature. It targeted scenery or nature rather than people. This also separates recreational surveillance from previously recognized forms of horizontal monitoring (Albrechtslund, 2008; Andrejevic, 2005; Koskela, 2009a; Marwick, 2012): the target is not necessarily a person, but can be anything that is in front of the camera. The fourth type of surveillance analyzed is *communicational surveillance*. Domestic surveillance cameras enabled some levels of communication between watchers and watched. For instance, some interviewees used the automatic functions of their system to notify family members that they (or someone else) had arrived safely to the secondary residence. In addition, the cameras were used to signal to the watcher or to greet her or him by waving at the camera. They were also used to monitor family members doing chores and then calling them on the phone to instruct them. Recreational and communicational uses demonstrate how these systems cannot be understood merely in technical terms, but need to be considered as socio-technical

systems (Norris, 2012b) or social mediums (Smith, 2007), emphasizing both the user and the technology.

In addition to these four types of surveillance which focus more on the purposes of watching, Article I analysed how residents experience conducting surveillance and being under surveillance in their own homes. The fifth type of surveillance presented and analysed is *sincere surveillance*. Domestic cameras were not used for spying on family members, or these uses were not brought up in the interviews. Rather, interviewees maintained that they used the cameras for 'honest' purposes. It seemed important to them that their motives as watchers were not questioned and that they were seen as sincere in their watching practices. This fifth type of surveillance reveals domestic surveillance as an ambivalent and complicated issue for the resident. Even though the interviewees themselves had decided to install surveillance in their homes, surveillance was by no means insignificant to them. While they used the equipment quite freely, many of them still had ambiguous and conflicted feelings about it. They wanted to feel safe and protected and protect their home, but at the same time they were annoyed or fearful that they might be watched by someone without their knowledge. This argument moves the core of analysis on domestic surveillance from simplistic notions of safety and protection of property towards more complicated issues regarding the potential of surveillance equipment to create feelings of safety and exposure simultaneously.

## 4.2.2 ONLINE CAMERAS AT THE INTERFACE OF SURVEILLANCE AND INTERNET STUDIES

Article II analyses the uses of all three camera systems (domestic cameras, boat club cameras and student club cameras) concurrently. The data are comprised of five interviews with boat club members, five interviews with student club camera users, and five (of seven) interviews with domestic camera system users. [15] Instead of separating users and systems from each other, the aim of this article was to treat all three systems as *online cameras* and examine them starting with their uses.

The grounding argument of Article II was that previous research on online cameras is largely separated into two different fields, Surveillance Studies and Internet Studies, and that separation can lead to some use practices being unrecognized. The aim of the article, then, is to reach beyond the said dichotomy by analysing how online cameras are used as functional tools in everyday life both as a form of surveillance and as equipment for entertainment. The objective is to recognize the practices of watching in different settings and to investigate the potential implications of those

---

[15] For the sake of clarity, two interviewees from the domestic camera surveillance system data set were omitted as they had their camera system in their secondary residence.

practices. The analysis focuses on four themes: presence, activity, entertainment and surveillance.

In Article II it is argued that these online cameras enable presence in a distant place through enabling awareness. This argument extends the ways in which presence has been previously understood, [16] particularly in the context of webcams (or surveillance cameras, for that matter). In webcam research presence is often analysed as 'telepresence', which involves a feeling of being someplace where one is not in fact physically present (see Wise, 2004: 428). However, webcams have not been found to achieve this type of presence. Deriving from the interviews of this research it seems that for the watchers of these camera feeds, presence meant presence as awareness. Unlike in telepresence, where one needs to be immersed in another place through a medium, these cameras enabled one to be present through being aware of the happenings of the given place at any given moment. With these systems awareness turned into a form of presence which did not require actual, tangible presence.

Besides presence, the cameras were also used as a form of activity. This included using the cameras for *substitution*, *confirmation*, and *communication*. Home and boat owners watched the feed when it was difficult or impossible to go to the place filmed: they used the cameras as substitutes. Students, in contrast, used the cameras when considering whether or not to go to the club room. While most of the time they could have easily just gone there, they often chose not to do so, at least not without first looking at the feed. Thus, they used the cameras for confirmation. Besides using cameras as a substitute or for confirmation, particularly home and student cameras were used for communicational activity: people checked to see if someone was at the place filmed so that the person could be asked to do something.

All three systems had some entertaining and surveillant functions. While watching these mediums was rarely only about watching but also about acting or deciding whether to act, there were some uses which were motivated by the desire to watch, and to entertain oneself by watching. This type of watching did not necessarily target people but focused on anything in front of the camera, for instance nature or wildlife. This kind of watching, or 'entertaining surveillance', is comparable to 'recreational surveillance' analysed in Article I. Furthermore, in all three camera systems surveillance-related uses were connected to the systems' presumed capabilities of deterring criminals and other unwanted people. The devices themselves as physical objects or the signs warning about surveillance were crucial in this, not so much the properties of

---

[16] Matthew Lombard and Theresa Ditton (1997) have examined a wide range of literature and identified six conceptualizations of presence: social richness; realism; transportation; immersion; social actor within medium; medium as social actor. Telepresence connects two of these: presence as transportation and presence as immersion. Presence as transportation considers how 'you are there', 'it is here', or 'we are together' in mediated environments, whereas presence as immersion 'emphasizes the idea of perceptual and psychological immersion' (Lombard & Ditton, 1997).

the devices and the manner of their use. Some home surveillance systems had a motion sensor which notified the resident in the case of movements in the house, but other than that none of the systems were monitored constantly. Instead, monitoring was intermittent and in many cases happened retrospectively.

One important difference between this research and previous studies on webcams is that these watchers were not dependent merely on images but could most of the time access the places filmed. Thus, these online cameras expanded real life places online. All three systems were used as mediums which enabled the watcher to express an interest in a real place which was important to her or him. Home cameras permitted viewing the home and the people there, boat cameras enabled monitoring fairly expensive property, and student cameras allowed observance of a place where much of the social activity on campus took place. Indeed, cameras were convenient tools in monitoring and keeping track of the happenings in these places. Surveillance produced through these online cameras can be defined as the monitoring gaze of everyday life in surroundings where watchers have a vested interest.

To summarize, devices examined in Article II have previously been treated as rather separate both technologically and socially. However, it seems they have become similar both in their technical capabilities and in the manner in which they are used. Online cameras are an essential part of today's media scenery, where people are in constant contact with each other. This is why scholars from the previously rather separated fields of Surveillance and Internet Studies could benefit from viewpoints borrowed from the other field. Indeed, were these cameras analysed merely in the context of one field, a wide variety of uses might not be recognized. More than being merely surveillance (relating to control) or entertainment (relating to play) devices, these online cameras operate as convenient equipment allowing combinations of different uses and enabling the interviewees to be active and to ease social insecurities. This suggests that any dichotomy of surveillance practices, such as care/control, or fear/fun, is not accurate in all cases: these devices were neither (surveillance) nor (entertainment) alone, but both of them and beyond.

# 5 THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL ARGUMENTS

This chapter summarizes the results from Articles III (subchapter 5.1) and IV (subchapter 5.2). By looking at the connections and combinations of surveillance as a control-related activity and as a game-like or playful practice, these two articles focus particularly on the second set of research questions.

## 5.1 TURNING SURVEILLANCE INTO A GAME

Article III focuses on the third subordinate research question: how are private surveillance practices encouraged through turning surveillance into a game? In the article (co-written with Koskela) we analyzed how the InternetEyes site functioned and how surveillance was operated through the site. The InternetEyes site cameras differed from those examined in the surroundings of homes, the boat club and the student club in Articles I and II. While in all the examined surroundings surveillance equipment was used by private individuals, the cameras in the InternetEyes site were not set up to protect one's own property or family as the domestic and boat club cameras were, nor were they set up for entertainment and social reasons as the student club cameras were. Instead they operated in the context of monitoring unknown places and people in a gamified setting. Gamification is manifested in the site by the viewers receiving points for each correct sighting they made, and losing points for sending incorrect or malicious alerts. The site included a leaderboard where all viewers could see their own points and ranking in comparison to that of others. [17]

Based on the analysis presented in Article III, we argue that surveillance executed through InternetEyes differs from surveillance implemented with other, more traditional surveillance cameras [18] and from other types of peer-to-peer surveillance in three ways. First, InternetEyes did not place surveillance in the hands of selected professionals, but anyone (living in the EU, the EEA, or other selected countries) could register as a user and begin conducting surveillance. As any of the registered users might also be a frequent customer in a place connected to the site, the role of watchers and watched

---

[17] The level of gamification within the site and the manner in which the reward-system functioned changed several times during the time the site was in operation. In fact, at the time of writing Article III there was no leaderboard for the site.

[18] In Article III we discuss traditional surveillance cameras in comparison to the InternetEyes cameras. By traditional surveillance cameras we refer to surveillance systems called Closed Circuit Television (CCTV), which are often used in retail establishments and, at their simplest, consist of a camera, a recording device, and a display monitor (Norris, 2012b, pp. 23–24).

could quickly change. This is something that is not possible with traditional surveillance camera systems, where access to the monitor room is usually restricted to essential personnel only.

Second, both watchers of the InternetEyes and those watched through it were in different positions than in traditional surveillance systems. In the context of traditional surveillance systems, it is usually possible to find information about who is operating the camera and the location of the monitoring room. This was not the case with InternetEyes cameras, as those watched had no way of knowing where the watchers were and who they were. Most likely the watchers were not in the same city as the watched, nor even in the same country and their identities remained hidden from the watched. Similarly, from the watchers' point of view, they did not know and could not choose where the feed they watched was coming from, as a random four-camera feed set-up was selected by the site. Furthermore, watchers were not allowed to monitor the results of any situation. When they gave an alert, they were routed away from the feed. Thus, surveillance was intended to be anonymous for both the watcher and the watched.

Third, as a peer-to-peer surveillance site InternetEyes differed from other recognized types of participation in surveillance, particularly participatory, social, lateral and hijacked surveillance (Albrechtslund, 2008; Marwick, 2012; Andrejevic, 2005; Koskela, 2009a). Participatory surveillance emphasizes the sharing practices and the reciprocality of the information gathering, whereas in InternetEyes site information moved in only one direction: that allowed by InternetEyes Ltd. [19] Social surveillance and lateral surveillance focus on keeping track of spouses, friends and relatives, whereas the InternetEyes site focused on unfamiliar persons. It was impossible to purposefully trace anyone known by the watcher through the site – indeed, that could only happen by accident. Also, the InternetEyes site moved beyond the types of surveillance practices described as 'hijacked' (Koskela, 2009a) as in InternetEyes the watchers merely monitored the images they were given and there were no real possibilities for being active in producing images or sharing them with a wider audience. The watcher of the site was merely a tool for surveillance, or a marionette working for the InternetEyes Company.

Based on our analysis we argue that the InternetEyes site formed a new type of participation to surveillance, which differed from other types of broadcasting surveillance material online. The closest comparison to the site is the Texas Virtual Border Watch Program (see pages 11-12), but there are also some major differences between the two. The Texas Program was available for anyone with an Internet connection, whereas joining InternetEyes was

---

[19] In traditional understanding, a surveillance camera 'represents total one-way-ness of the gaze by making it impossible to look back' (Koskela, 2003, p. 298). This one-way-ness is still visible in the InternetEyes cameras. However, the feed does not end with the watcher, but moves forward to the owner of the camera and the representatives of the company. Thus, information still moves only in a single direction, but it moves further than it did in traditional systems.

possible only for people living in selected countries. In the Texas Program correct sightings were not rewarded and false sightings were not punished as they were in the InternetEyes site. Furthermore, and this is perhaps the most essential difference, in the Texas Program there were no game-like elements, which were crucial in the InternetEyes site.

Indeed, we see that the game-like elements of the site could operate to motivate people to participate in this type of surveillance. Participating in surveillance in this manner can be experienced as exciting and 'fun' for the viewer. Consequently, gamification could be seen as one factor in encouraging private surveillance practices. However, while participation might be playful, the site aims to increase control. Indeed, the site is an intriguing hybrid of game and control, and as such an illustrative example of surveillance turned ludic.

## 5.2 ANALYSING SURVEILLANCE PRACTICES FROM A LUDIC PERSPECTIVE

Article IV analyses the connections between surveillance and play in a different manner than Articles I-III and previous research. The connections between surveillance and play/game have previously been examined through analysing playful uses of surveillance technology (Articles I and II; see also e.g. Albrectslund & Dubbeld, 2005; Ellerbrok, 2011) and through examining gamified surveillance (Article III). In Article IV we aimed to further the discussion on ludic surveillance by viewing these connections from a new viewpoint.

Article IV is grounded on the argument that surveillance has many playful and game-like functions, and they have not yet been addressed to their full extent. To develop the examination of surveillance as a multifaceted phenomenon we used the vocabulary of play and games to elaborate surveillance practices and functions: the spheres of play and games were approached as metaphors which were then used to examine various surveillance practices ranging from urban settings to virtual surroundings. In addition to developing research and analysis on surveillance, we also aimed to develop and rejuvenate metaphorical thinking in Surveillance Studies. Most previously introduced surveillance metaphors were built on the panopticon metaphor, whereas our aim was to create completely new metaphors. The five metaphors we created are: (1) cat-and-mouse, (2) hide-and-seek, (3) labyrinth, (4) sleight-of-hand, and (5) poker. The first three reveal perhaps more commonly analysed modes of surveillance, whereas the last two enable one to examine more complex practices.

First, we argue that surveillance can be understood as a *cat-and-mouse* game, as 'catching someone in the act' is a common reason for live monitoring of places and people. Cat-and-mouse game can take place when controllers aim to catch anyone who has committed a crime or in other ways behaved

antisocially. This game can also mimic a chase, for instance, in urban spaces, where controllers are often private security guards monitoring young people's activities (see e.g. Koskela, 2009b, pp. 280–283). In these instances, both participants are aware of each other and the game they are playing and the one who is faster, luckier, cleverer or more impudent wins.

Second, another regular surveillance function is to use monitoring for 'finding someone or something hidden'. Thus, surveillance can be understood as a *hide-and-seek* game between the searcher (surveillant) and the searched (anyone wishing to avoid surveillance). Hide-and-seek is slower in nature than cat-and-mouse and can entail, for instance, using recordings from surveillance cameras to uncover actions. This type of tracking can take place in online and offline environments. For instance, hide-and-seek can also entail gathering pieces of information from different sources and aiming to create a whole picture (or pictures) of someone or something based on those gathered fragments. Maria Los (2006) analyses this type of information extraction and its use in the process of creating data doubles, attempted copies of something or someone, which can form quite differently depending on where and by whom information is gathered and for what purpose it is re-compiled.

Third, not only surveillance practices but also 'surveillance spaces' (cf. McGrath, 2012) can be analysed through metaphorical approach. We use the concept of a *labyrinth* to examine how people navigate through surveillance. Surveillant practices are increasingly taking place in combinations of online and offline worlds, and if one wishes to remain unseen from surveillance some maneuvering skills in labyrinth-like spaces are required. Furthermore, while some people might be indifferent to surveillance, it still exists. The labyrinth metaphor also exemplifies how surveillance structures are constantly changing. For instance, cameras in urban spaces are installed, removed and operated without much notice and people can never be sure whether they are being monitored or not, even when there is a camera pointing in their direction.

Fourth, the *sleight-of-hand* metaphor examines more complex practices of hiding and seeking, for instance hiding in plain sight, or faking, mimicking or masquerading in order to hide from surveillance. In online environments this metaphor connects to, for instance, creating fake identities. It can be done for malicious purposes in an attempt to deceive someone, but people also experiment with their identities or facets of their identity without intending to purposefully deceive anyone. Thus, this type of 'hiding' can take place for multiple purposes. David J. Phillips (2005) discusses the construction and performance of identity particularly in the context of ubiquitous computing. He reminds us that identities are always multiple, and recognizes how 'successful social life involves [...] appropriate performance of a particular identity in a particular situation' (ibid., p. 98). Thus, facets of identity are always either put forward or pushed back depending on the context in which they are 'performed'. The sleight-of-hand metaphor also allows us to examine how fake surveillance equipment (either dummy cameras or real equipment

which has been taken out of use but left in its original place) can diminish the value of surveillance as a whole, as people can no longer be sure when surveillance is actually taking place. In urban culture this sleight-of-hand attitude has become common and acceptable.

*Poker*, the fifth metaphor, focuses on activities where the purpose of 'the player' is to beat the opponent. As it is the only true game among these metaphors, it allows the examination of rules in a different manner than the other metaphors. There is no negotiation in poker or room for interpretation in its rules. To win in a poker game one needs to know the rules and be talented in estimating probabilities and making decisions based on incomplete information. From the authority point-of-view the most obvious baseline for poker in the surveillance context is counter-terrorist schemes, where observations and information is cross-referenced to known probabilities, and decisions are based on these comparisons. However, for an individual this kind of 'game' is tricky, as it is difficult to control all the information available on oneself and to know how that information is combined and used. If, for instance, a person is placed in the 'unwanted individual' category, it is challenging to change that status. Set rules and categories are difficult or even impossible to negotiate. [20] We have also used the poker metaphor in order to illustrate moral and ethical dilemmas in gamifying surveillance practices: those surveilled in gamified surveillance applications might seem to be mere objects in the game and not real people with real consequences. To 'win' in a (surveillance) game always means that someone else loses.

Unlike in the traditional, centralized context of surveillance, in present-day surveillance there is no single authority watching nor a single context of surveillance, but rather there can be multiple players with variable motives. Furthermore, surveillant actions can entail both playful and serious sides. The main argument we wish to make with these metaphors is that examining the game-like and playful elements of surveillance reveals how the practice moves beyond power and discipline to include other characteristics. These metaphors can help recognize and understand changes in surveillance practices, including new forms of action, resistance and identities. They can be utilized as a toolkit of sorts. Indeed, new analytical tools are needed to analyse increasingly complex practices of monitoring and being monitored. These tools could include metaphors built on playful and game-like vocabulary.

---

[20] In a similar vein, Michalis Lianos and Mary Douglas (2000) discuss automated socio-technical environments as technological mediation in human relations, where no human operator is needed but functions are based on parameters programmed into the system. For this reason these environments cannot be negotiated with.

# 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

## 6.1 HOW WE GOT WHERE WE ARE?

The research process leading to this point has been somewhat unexpected, as research processes often are. Originally this thesis was planned to focus on responsibilized surveillance, but already the very first interviews conducted with student camera users shifted the focus. In conducting those interviews I was surprised to realize that surveillant uses of cameras were in the minority. Indeed, many of the students did not recognize their cameras as surveillance systems but emphasized their social and everyday life uses. Based on this observation I began examining cameras as a part of users' everyday life practices: analysing the equipment in a wider context than the control-related surveillance framework.

When moving on to interview boat club camera users, I was yet again surprised to see how little trust the users had about the devices' potential as recording equipment. As surveillance devices these cameras relied on deterrence. When it came to using the cameras, convenience was quintessential for the watcher, who could view the situation from her or his own computer without having to drive down to the pier. These observations laid the ground for one of the important findings of this research, further examined in this chapter: understanding the practical nature of these cameras and analysing convenience as a framework where private surveillance practices operate, thus adding to previous contexts where surveillance has been analysed.

Next, when conducting interviews with domestic surveillance users, I was not surprised to find that the equipment was thoroughly connected to issues of safety and securing the home, as the systems were planned and marketed for these purposes. However, it was unanticipated to discover the residents' level of self-reflection when they considered their own role as watchers. As the cameras allowed the residents unlimited visual access to their home (or to be more accurate, to the specific locations of the cameras) and they lived there with other people, most of them had set some kind of limits for themselves in terms of watching. For instance, they said they never used the cameras when their spouse was at home. Furthermore, they had several ways of micromanaging their own and their family's exposure to the system. Thus, they had considered their own role both in terms of watching their premises and being watched there. These roles and the position of the surveillant are yet another important theme in this final chapter.

In very early stages of this research process the then-new InternetEyes site intrigued me and sent me on an unexpected journey towards game studies. As a gamified surveillance site InternetEyes was something unseen before and something not seen since. In my view, the site took the discussion, which until

then had only begun analysing surveillance as a playful practice and surveillance equipment as playthings, to the next level, where the work of watching was outsourced and turned into a game but the process of surveillance still related to control. The InternetEyes site exemplified the tension between surveillance as both control-related and playful practice and as such had a vast influence in framing this research.

Finally, my journey to investigate the connections between surveillance and games and to examine different ways of understanding playful surveillance concluded with forming and developing (in co-operation with Koskela) five metaphors on surveillance. This theoretical opening yet again turns the tables on surveillance and play/game, as these five metaphors can be utilized in analysing surveillance practices from a ludic approach. Understanding surveillance as ludic sees it as a practice which can combine playful actions and motives to mundane manners of conducting, coping with or resisting surveillance. This final chapter draws together my findings through further discussing the themes summarized here.

## 6.2 BETWEEN CONTROL AND PLAY: ONLINE CAMERAS AS PEER-TO-PEER SURVEILLANCE

The first larger research question of this thesis aims at revealing how practices analysed here can be placed in relation to previous research on surveillance in the contexts of control, fear, preparedness towards individual risks and playfulness, and move beyond them. In terms of fear and risk preparedness these online camera systems are similar to any visible camera system: they can create and maintain a security consciousness where fear of crime and collective awareness of risks has become institutionalized (Garland, 2001, p. 163). However, while risk and security issues were important in installing some devices (particularly at the homes, the boat club, and the InternetEyes locations), and the existence of the cameras (and signs warning about them) were understood to be relevant in reducing risks, actual uses were not limited to those contexts. Practices of watching moved beyond alleviating fears and minimizing risks. These systems were convenient tools for monitoring places and property and at the same time they were easy to use for entertainment purposes and peer monitoring.

The examined systems and their uses can be further contextualized by comparing them to four previously recognized types of peer-to-peer surveillance analysed in this thesis [participatory surveillance (Albrectslund, 2008), social surveillance (Marwick, 2012), lateral surveillance (Andrejevic, 2005) and hijacked surveillance (Koskela, 2011a)]. These types of peer-to-peer surveillance have three important commonalities with each other. First, they all focus on monitoring which targets laterally rather than top down. Second, they focus on mutuality and sharing practices: watching and monitoring is possible for everyone wanting to participate. Third, they emphasize

empowerment and analyse watching as a subjectivity-building experience. If the camera systems examined in this research are analysed from these viewpoints, they seem imperfect as peer-to-peer surveillance devices. [21]

First, the camera systems investigated were not used solely for peer-to-peer monitoring, but they also enabled functions relating to top down forms of control. For instance, domestic cameras were designed for securing the house and, for that reason, control-related watching was a built-in function of the system even though it was not used only for that purpose. Even more so, the main purpose for using boat club cameras was to monitor property. While it was possible to monitor other club members, watching mostly targeted one's own boat or its surroundings. Student cameras differed from other systems in the sense that they were often used for social purposes which were similar to previously recognized forms of peer-to-peer surveillance, namely to see if the watcher had friends in the room and what they were doing. However, these cameras also had control-related uses: for instance, parents used them to monitor if their adult child was at the club room and not in class. Thus, these systems did not focus merely on peer-to-peer surveillance. Rather, they combined lateral watching practices to top down forms of control-related monitoring. Similar activity was visible in the InternetEyes site. As volunteers monitored business locations where they themselves undoubtedly went as well, the site enabled lateral practices of watching. However, surveillance itself was control-oriented and was set within the context of top-down monitoring. So even if for the watchers surveillance might be presented as participatory monitoring, objectively it still worked as a top-down form of control. [22] What connected all uses and cameras was that watching was made easy and the cameras provided a convenient way of monitoring places, people and property.

---

[21] One needs to remember that participatory surveillance (Albrectslund, 2008) and social surveillance (Marwick, 2012) as concepts both focus primarily on social media sites and thus transferring them to investigate camera surveillance practices needs to be done with care. Albrectslund's (2008) contribution to research on peer-to-peer surveillance was to suggest in the first place that the discussion should not be formed merely within the frames of privacy concerns or online snooping, but instead stem from sharing practices and mutuality within these activities. As similar practices can be witnessed in contexts beyond social media sites, I feel it important to examine whether participatory surveillance could be a useful concept in their examination. Similarly, the kind of eavesdropping and inquiry described by Marwick (2012) as the basis of social surveillance can easily take place in other contexts than social media sites and therefore could and should be analysed beyond those sites. Thus, although originally focusing on social media sites, these two concepts can contribute to examining practices in other environments too.

[22] In a similar vein, Andrejevic (2007) examines how lateral surveillance and the promise of interactivity is in reality covering how information is gathered 'in the service of top-down forms of political and economic control'. Thus, his analysis of lateral surveillance moves beyond merely recognizing horizontal monitoring to simultaneously investigating how it extends the state's or commercial entities' powers.

Second, even though watching was theoretically possible for everyone in the reach of these systems, in practice only some people exploited that possibility. For instance, domestic cameras were often operated only by a single family member, the one interviewed. Although everyone in the family could have accessed the system, they chose not to (due to, for instance, lack of skills or interest). [23] This also applies, of course, to boat club and student club camera users. Similarly, while participating in the InternetEyes program was in theory possible for everyone (living in certain countries), actual participation largely depended on the resources and interest of each watcher. Also, participating was only possible if one knew that the possibility existed: it seems unlikely that all the people going to the locations using the InternetEyes system had ever heard about it. Thus, participation was truly only possible for a few eager and well-informed people with the resources and interest in this type of activity.

Furthermore, mutuality and sharing practices within these devices differed from those researched before. Mutuality between watcher and watched took place in domestic systems when they were used as communicational devices (see Smith, 2007 on a similar process of using CCTV cameras to enable communication): in some cases the watched used the camera to signal to the watcher. Communication took place as it was convenient for both watcher and watched: they were already monitoring the feed or knew they were being watched. Additional sharing practices took place when images captured by these cameras were shared with friends or family. For instance, one domestic surveillance system user reported sharing still images of her dog taken with the home camera. Likewise, students circulated still images of their fellow students doing something they considered funny. Thus, sharing did take place, albeit in a different manner than previously recognized. Sharing practices within the InternetEyes site further differed from other systems examined here. It seems that instead of sharing practices taking place between watchers and watched, sharing in the site happened between fellow watchers. They could monitor each other's performance through the leaderboard and compete with each other by comparing points they received from correct sightings. Like 'sharing', this type of activity is quite shallow and mostly focuses on one's own performance.

Third, empowerment and subjectivity-building were not central attributes connected to using these systems, and they did not arise from the interviews. Furthermore, they were not central facets in analysing the InternetEyes site and the monitoring practices it allowed. However, some aspects of uses could be examined through those themes. For instance, domestic surveillance systems were used as a 'safety net' by women who had to spend nights at home alone. Although no one used the concept of empowerment when reflecting on these feelings, they found their system made them feel safe and easier about

---

[23] On this point I rely only on the statements made by my interviewees, as I did not interview each family member on why they did not watch the camera feed.

being home alone. It seems that more than being an empowering or subjectivity-building experience, watching aimed at making decisions and at reducing insecurity. Some of the systems were used to alleviate concerns and these practices were simplified by the convenience and ease of using them.

Based on the arguments made above, it seems that even though the cameras investigated here do enable peer watching, at least to some extent, they fit poorly within the existing frames of peer-to-peer surveillance. The key is that the uses of these cameras move beyond the kind of reciprocal practices previously analysed as peer-to-peer surveillance and they combine top-down forms of control to watching over someone or watching to satisfy curiosity. Instead of watching to while 'away the time online' (Andrejevic, 2007, p. 229), monitoring conducted with these cameras was commonly purpose-oriented. The devices were convenient tools in everyday life and using them was practical.

As a conclusion I argue that the various uses of all four types of cameras move beyond frames of risk, fear and play. They connect lateral and light-hearted monitoring practices to top-down forms of control. In addition to operating as deterrents, they connect to playful behaviour: cameras at home, the boat club and the student club enabled recreational and entertaining watching and the InternetEyes cameras supported gamified surveillance. Based on these observations I suggest that peer-to-peer surveillance in everyday life should be analysed from a practical viewpoint: these devices are above all convenient tools for the user. This proposition opens up new arguments on the position and role of the user.

In the following subchapter (6.3) I consider the InternetEyes system as a combination of control and play. Furthermore, I analyse watchers in the context of responsiblized surveillance by viewing them as marionettes. Following that, I move on to analysing how the framework of convenience could be utilized in future research, particularly in terms of analysing the subject positions of watchers (6.4).

## 6.3 COMBINING CONTROL AND PLAY: GAMIFYING SURVEILLANCE

The second larger research question sets out to deepen the analysis on the connections between surveillance as a control-related and as a playful practice. Previous surveillance research recognizes how surveillance can be a playful practice and how surveillance equipment can be used as playthings (see e.g. Ellerbrok, 2011). However, there has been considerably less research on gamified surveillance and that research focuses on self-surveillance (see e.g. Whitson, 2013) instead of analysing how surveillance practices targeting others are turned into a game (as we examined in Article III). Indeed, even research using the InternetEyes site as a case example (Trottier, 2014) reduces the gamified nature of the site to merely mentioning the points-system

incorporated in the site as an incentive for participation, instead of grounding the analysis on the game-like practices of watching.

Examining the InternetEyes site strictly in the frame of responsibilization invites different analysis on the positions of the watchers than when the focus is on game-like facets of the site: participants in responsibilized surveillance can be characterized as marionettes. By definition, a marionette is a figure controlled from above by using strings attached to its body: a marionette is moved around by another and has no will of its own. Pertti Karkama (1981, p. 15) has argued that in certain cultural and societal situations play seems to convert into an act in which the player herself becomes a pawn in the game instead of being a player. Surveillance sites which build on responsibilization seem to manifest such situations. People who participate in responsibilized surveillance are not purely free agents doing surveillance as they see fit, but they are turned into puppets working for policies set by someone else. Free agents are turned into pawns played by someone above them.

Marionette as a concept (and as a metaphor) allows analysing participants not as active agents but as tools of surveillance. Even though the marionette's participation is voluntary, the forms of participation cannot be chosen. Thus, the willingness to participate turns into a sham and the level of individual agency remains quite low. This view of surveillants is reminiscent of seeing them as 'humble servants' who are merely doing what is asked of them (Koskela, 2011b); 'diminished subjects' who are risk conscious and preoccupied with safety issues (Furedi, 1997); and 'insecurity subjects' who minimize risks through consumption (Monahan, 2010). Characterizing surveillants in these ways stems from a focus on risk, fear and discipline and downplays the authority and agency of participants who are seen merely as trying to avoid risks and play it safe.

However, a marionette is not the only relevant characterization of the individual participant in my research, not even in the context of the InternetEyes site, as it does not take into consideration the game-like functions of the site and the agency of the players in the game. Indeed, those participating in InternetEyes are not simply played but are playing. If the site was considered merely a responsibilization scheme, it would be logical to analyse the surveillant as a marionette. However, the more emphasis that is laid on the game-like characteristics of the site, the more active the player is. If the watcher is playing a game, she or he is taking on an active role. I argue that introducing game-like characteristics to participation can give the participant more agency. However, it should be noted how this agency can remain shallow in the sense that it does not increase participants' chances in setting the policies of the site or deciding what they can see and when. Marionette as a concept correlates with previous conceptualizations of participants as 'humble servants' and 'diminished subjects'. However, the more focus that is given to the site as a game, the less accurate is the marionette concept from the point of view of the player.

I consider that the game-like characteristics of the InternetEyes site are essential for its functions. I argue that it is precisely combining those characteristics with control-related practices that make the site such a specific and distinctive form of surveillance (and a game). In the remainder of this subchapter I consider the game-like nature of the InternetEyes site. When analysing game-like functions of the InternetEyes site, we concluded that the site forms as a surveillance reality game (Article III). This conclusion challenges traditional notions of games belonging to a separate space from real life, a 'magic circle', where actions and consequences remain within the game. In that understanding the concept of a 'reality game' would be a contradiction as games are not seen as a part of reality, rather they bend or escape from reality. However, newer game research has challenged that understanding, as games are no longer seen as separate from other spheres of life but increasingly spreading beyond game spaces. (See Calleja, 2010; Consalvo, 2009; Deterding et al., 2011; Malaby, 2007; Yee, 2006.) As the definition of 'a game' widens it can become difficult to distinguish between games and 'artifacts with game elements' (Deterding et al., 2011). Indeed, more than being a game in a strict sense, the InternetEyes site could be understood as a gamified surveillance site where game elements are used 'in non-game contexts' (ibid.). Perhaps even more accurate would be to analyse the site as a 'pervasive game': breaking traditional boundaries of games and encouraging interaction in both serious and playful mindsets (Stenros, Montola & Mäyrä, 2007). As the site combined gamified characteristics with surveillance practices it enabled both serious and playful participation simultaneously.

The underlying question in this discussion of course is, did the watchers think they were playing a game? If yes, what consequences would that have for surveillance? Perhaps the most important consequence would be that if the watchers were playing, they were not operating to prevent actions – on the contrary. As points were received only after something illegal was spotted, players were hoping for that to happen. As a consequence, the real people they were watching might have merely seemed to be a part of the game. For watchers it was better to see something suspicious happening than to try to prevent it (for instance, by notifying the shopowner earlier). This challenges how we are to understand the purpose of surveillance in this context: was it to prevent actions or to catch and punish perpetrators and reward those who aided capturing them?

## 6.4 MOVING BEYOND CONTROL AND PLAY: CONVENIENCE AS A DRIVING LOGIC FOR SURVEILLANCE

Monitoring camera feeds from homes, a boat club and a student club had similar characteristics: watching was mostly practical and purpose-oriented. The cameras enabled a convenient and easy way to be active. In addition to

allowing peer-to-peer surveillance and enabling entertainment the cameras operated as functional and practical tools in everyday life.

The focus of this thesis has been on analysing private practices of watching. The examination of connections between playful and control-related surveillance practices and recognizing convenience as a relevant context of action can also aid the development of thinking on subject-object positions of the watchers in online camera systems. Thus, discussion on the roles and positions of watchers can be furthered based on the analysis of private uses. Above (6.3.) I have focused on watchers in the context of responsibilized surveillance by viewing them as marionettes. This subchapter moves forward to analyse surveillants in a wider context (than responsibilization policies) as active and informed agents. While marionette might be an accurate metaphor in analyzing participants in some forms of responsibilized surveillance, it fits poorly to the types of practices witnessed throughout in this thesis. I argue that people conducting surveillance in their everyday life environments are indeed often aware of their actions and informed on the nature of the devices used, and that they manage surveillance to the best of their knowledge. This point also relates to the fact that they operate surveillance devices in places where they are both subjects and objects of monitoring.

Previous research does not consider at length why people choose to use surveillance equipment. However, it seems that (too) often the approach of surveillance researchers to their subjects is that those participating in monitoring tasks or giving information on themselves to surveillance-related applications are somehow ignorant or naïve as they willingly use systems which could potentially exploit them (this concern has been elequantly expressed by Ellerbrok, 2010). This view gives little credit to the participants and, like the metaphor of a marionette, diminishes them to the role of ignorant tools.

Pinelopi Troullinou (2016), for instance, has analysed individual participation as 'being seduced' by surveillance. According to Troullinou, 'seductive surveillance' is built into the design of surveillance-capable devices and different online applications, such as smart phones and social media sites. Her argument is that people are seduced by these devices and applications, and as surveillance is built into them, people are actually seduced by surveillance. Although I find the concept of seductive surveillance intriguing, in my view different devices and application have different mechanisms for attracting users and these mechanisms should be separated and analysed in more detail to determine what actually is seducing users: whether it is the convenience of the equipment, the empowered feeling that comes from using it, the possibilities it provides for showcasing personal details, or the opportunities it gives to browse through other people's private affairs. Lumping these together as seduction results in losing their important distinctions. Furthermore, analysing surveillance as seduction gives little credit to the participant, who is seen as being driven by her or his desires, and unable to resist the allure of surveillance.

From another point of view, Ellerbrok (2010; see also Koskela, 2004) analyses empowerment as an important factor explaining why people use surveillance equipment. She argues that controversial technologies can be empowering in the context of the users' lived experience. The strength of Ellerbrok's argument is her conclusion that while empowerment might be crucial in explaining how individuals experience surveillance technology, researchers must consider technologies beyond individual experiences. Even though the individual participant might experience empowerment, surveillance technology can still entail potentially exploitative traits and researchers need to consider both these sides. (Ellerbrok, 2010, pp. 215–216.)

Besides empowerment, Ellerbrok (2011) has also analysed 'play' as the driving logic for the intensification of surveillance. She argues that the convenience, practicality and effectivity of some newer surveillance technologies does not drive their expansion by themselves, but rather we should consider the 'childlike enthusiasm' these technologies are played with (Ellerbrok, 2011, pp. 536–537). While I agree with her on play being an important factor in private uses of surveillance technology (as it has been one of the defining elements in studying the uses of surveillance technology in this thesis), I consider convenience to be another important element worth studying here.

While there are facets of the camera technologies investigated in this thesis which might make users wish to use them, empower them, or be connected to their playfulness, none of these explanations on their own seem adequate to explain the uses of surveillance technology. In my view the manner in which these cameras induced users was grounded on the convenience of these devices. Users were not ignorant and instead chose to use these technologies despite their uncertainties (which concerned, for instance, someone unauthorized accessing the feed from the cameras aimed at them). In many cases surveillants were active and informed agents, aware of the potential risks related to their devices, and managing them to the best of their knowledge.

The question which then naturally follows is: could a new term be given to the active participating subject? Based on this research, I suggest *informed subject* as an alternative to previously suggested concepts. The informed subject chooses to participate; is aware of potential risks related to surveillance equipment and mitigates them to her or his best knowledge; and participates not only in control-related surveillance practices but in other, more playful contexts of monitoring too. This subject and her or his actions are not dictated by fear or risk-preparedness, but are determined by convenience and practicality, and by managing the undesired consequences of surveillance. Examining the participant as an informed subject allows us to widen the analytical framework from risk and fear to include other traits. At the same time it acknowledges that while surveillance might be executed in a playful manner or for practical reasons, the context of control still operates in the background.

The two arguments I make on the positions of watchers in surveillance camera systems reveal important aspects about the realities of participation. Marionette as a concept means that the participant in responsibilized surveillance policies is not seen as an active agent, but as a tool of surveillance. While marionettes might participate voluntarily, the mode of participation cannot be chosen but is dictated from above. Marionette as a concept links to previously recognized forms of subjectivity which are diminished and operated under guidance. It connects with surveillance framed by risk, fear and preparedness. At the opposite end, participating in mundane surveillance practices can develop differently if and when participants' have more agency: if they can choose when to watch, what to watch, and with what consequences, and they can manage their own visibility concerning the system and the ways they operate as watchers. While I recognize the existence of the marionette subject, I aspire to push further the idea of the informed subject, particularly in the context of ludic surveillance. This characterization could have potential for future research examining surveillance subjects. That research would recognize the complexity and ambiguity of private experiences of surveillance and surveillant practices without underestimating the agency of those participating.

## 6.5  CONCLUSIONS: DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF LUDIC SURVEILLANCE THROUGH A METAPHORICAL APPROACH

Surveillance Studies as a research field began its analysis by viewing surveillance as a centralized top-down form of control. As theoretical understanding of surveillance practices developed, other examination contexts rose. These included empowerment, performance, resistance, and, finally, play. While some notions of control are essential when analysing whether or not surveillance takes place or whether devices are surveillant in nature or not, this research holds on to the idea that other overlapping contexts are worth examining too.

Indeed, the tension between control and play in private surveillance practices has been a major theme of this work. The opening of this summary article described how a surveillance camera was used as a plaything by four young boys. That anecdote demonstrates how connections between controlling and playful surveillance are not merely an interest of academic studies but are very much present in everyday life. With this research my goal has been to demonstrate how private surveillance practices move between the two large themes of control and play and can be analysed as ludic surveillance. In addition, I have argued that as private surveillance practices take place in the minutiae of everyday life, convenience and practicality should be acknowledged as relevant contexts of action alongside of control and play.

Different forms of ludic surveillance can be witnessed throughout our society, in mundane uses of video camera technology at homes, and at places of recreation and consumption. I have argued, that gamified surveillance operates as a distinctive form of both surveillance and a game, where surveillance takes place in the context of control but surveillants do not necessarily have control. Those conducting surveillance can have playful modes and intentions, but surveillance can still operate as authoritative or exploitative. Control and play can indeed happen simultaneously.

Developing metaphorical thinking in studying surveillance has been an important goal of this research. As surveillance practices have become more complicated, previously powerful metaphors seem to have lost their explanatory powers, and new, carefully-formed metaphors are needed. This research includes five novel metaphors on surveillance practices and places. They propose that control-related surveillance can be analysed from a ludic perspective. The metaphors created enable one to view everyday surveillance practices as complex and multifaceted phenomena. As tools for investigating surveillance metaphors can act as a forward-looking analytical method. Perhaps they could even offer new perspectives on examining surveillance subjects. The metaphorical approach to surveillance practices is still considered a work in progress and will continue to develop in further research. Although I am nearing the end of this doctoral dissertation, it seems the work has only just begun.

# REFERENCES

Albrechtslund, A. (2008). Online social networking as participatory surveillance. *First Monday*, *13*(3).

Albrechtslund, A., & Dubbeld, L. (2005). The plays and arts of surveillance: Studying surveillance as entertainment. *Surveillance & Society*, *3*, 216–221.

Albrechtslund, A., & Nørgaard Glud, L. (2010). Empowering residents: A Theoretical framework for negotiating surveillance technologies. *Surveillance & Society, 8*, 235–250.

Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV. The work of being watched*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publishers.

Andrejevic, M. (2005). The work of watching one another: Lateral surveillance, risk, and governance. *Surveillance & Society*, *2*, 479–497.

Andrejevic, M. (2007). *iSpy: Surveillance and power in the interactive era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Baker, C. (2004). Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory, method and practice. Second edition* (pp. 162–176). London: Sage Publications.

Ball, K., & Webster, F. (2003). The intensification of surveillance. In K. Ball & F. Webster (Eds.), *The intensification of surveillance: Crime, terrorism and warfare in the information age* (pp. 1–15). London: Pluto.

Bauer, M W. (2000). Classical content analysis: A review. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.) Qualitative researching with text, image and sound (pp. 132–152). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Beck, I. (1992). *Risk society. Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.

Bell, D. (2009). Surveillance is sexy. *Surveillance & Society, 6*, 203–212.

Bigo, D. (2006). Security, exception, ban and surveillance. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 46–68). Cullompton: Willan.

Bogard, W. (2006). Surveillance assemblages and lines of flight. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing Surveillance. The Panopticon and Beyond* (pp. 97–122). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Bruno, F. (2012). Surveillance and participation on Web 2.0. In K. Ball, K. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies* (pp. 343–351). London: Routledge.

Bryman, A. (2001). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calleja, G. (2010). Digital games and escapism. *Games and Culture, 5*, 335–353.

Consalvo, M. (2009). There is no magic circle. *Games and Culture*, *4*, 408–417.

Deterding, S., Khaled, R., Nacke L. E., & Dixon D. (2011). Gamification: Toward a definition. *Proceedings of the CHI2011 gamification workshop*. May 7, Vancouver, Canada.

Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative data analysis. A user-friendly guide for social scientists*. London: Routledge.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Gibson, D. R. (2010). More than a game: Sociological theory from the theories of games. *Sociological theory, 28*, 247–271.

Doyle, A. (2006). An alternative current in surveillance and control: Broadcasting surveillance footage of crimes. In K. D. Haggerty & R. V. Ericson (Eds.), *The new politics of surveillance and visibility* (pp. 199–224). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ellerbrok, A. (2010). Empowerment: Analysing technologies of multiple variable visibility. *Surveillance & Society, 8*, 200–220.

Ellerbrok, A. (2011). Playful biometrics: Controversial technology through the lens of play. *The Sociological Quarterly, 52*, 528–547.

Fuchs, C. (2011). How can surveillance be defined? *MATRIZes, 5*, 109–133.

Fuchs, C. (2015). Commentary: Surveillance and critical theory. *Media and Communication*, *3*(2), 6–9.

Furedi, F. (1997). *Culture of fear. Risk-taking and the morality of low expectation*. London: Cassell.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish. The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin books.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control. Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gilliom, J. (2001). *Overseers of the poor. Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of lrivacy*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Gray, D.E. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage Publications.

Haggerty, K. (2006). Tear down the walls: On demolishing the panopticon. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 23–45). Cullompton: Willan.

Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology, 51*, 605–622.

Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2006). The new politics of surveillance and visibility. In K.D. Haggerty & R.V. Ericson (Eds.), *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility* (pp. 3–25). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Huizinga, J. (1938/1955). *Homo ludens. A study of the play element in culture*. Boston, MA: The Beacon Press.

Innes, M. (2001). Control creep. *Sociological Research Online, 6*(3).

Karkama, P. (1981) Tosileikkiä – Tosi ja leikki taiteessa. In P. Laaksonen (Ed.), Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 61 (pp. 15–26). Helsinki: SKS.

Koskela, H. (2003). 'Cam Era' – The contemporary urban panopticon. *Surveillance & Society, 1*, 292–313.

Koskela, H. (2004). Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones: Empowering exhibitionism. *Surveillance & Society, 2*, 199–215.

Koskela, H. (2006). 'The Other Side of Surveillance': Webcams, power, and agency. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 163–181). Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Koskela, H. (2009a). Hijacking surveillance? The new moral landscapes of amateur photographing. In K.F. Aas, H.O. Gundhus, & H.M. Lomell (Eds.), *Technologies of (In)security: The Surveillance of Everyday Life* (pp. 147–167). Routledge/Cavendish: London.

Koskela, H. (2009b). *Pelkokierre. Pelon politiikka, turvamarkkinat ja kamppailu kaupunkitilasta*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Koskela, H. (2010). Did you spot an alien? Voluntary vigilance, borderwork and the Texas Virtual Border Watch Program. *Space and Polity, 14*, 103–121.

Koskela, H. (2011a). "Don't mess with Texas!": *Texas Virtual Border Watch Program* and the (botched) politics of responsibilization. *Crime, Media, Culture, 7*, 49–66.

Koskela, H. (2011b). Hijackers and humble servants: Individuals as camwitnesses in contemporary controlwork. *Theoretical Criminology, 15* 269–282.

Koskela, H., & Mäkinen, L. A. (2016). Disguised faces, illuminated suspects, and the great spectacle of surveillance. In L. Wolthers, D. Vujanovic & N. Östlind (Eds.), *WATCHED! Surveillance, Art and Photography* (pp. 218–225). Cologne/Germany: Walther König.

Koskela, H., & Tuominen, M. (2003*). "Kakspiippunen juttu" Tutkimus helsinkiläisten suhtautumisesta kameravalvontaan*. Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskuksen tutkimuksia 3/2013. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Kuokkanen, A., & Alvesalo-Kuusi, A. (2014). Työn elektroninen valvonta osana työntekijän hallinnan jatkumoa ja turvallistamista. *Oikeus, 43*, 30–49.

Lianos, M., & Douglas, M. (2000). Dangerization and the end of deviance. The institutional environment. In D. Garland & R. Sparks (Eds.), *Criminology and social theory* (pp. 103–125). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindqvist, M. K. (2005). *Kameravalvonnan rooli nyky-yhteiskunnassa: Onko kameravalvonta tekninen toimenpide vai sosiaalista toimintaa?* University of Helsinki, Department of Sociology. Master's thesis.

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997). At the heart of it all: The concept of presence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *3(2).*

Los, M. (2006). Looking into the future: Surveillance, globalization and the totalitarian potential. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing surveillance: The panopticon and beyond* (pp. 69–94). Cullompton: Willan.

Lyon D. (1994). *The electronic eye. The rise of surveillance society*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lyon, D. (2001). *Surveillance society. Monitoring everyday life*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance studies: an overview*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyon, D. (2014). The emerging surveillance culture. In A. Jansson & M. Christensen (Eds.), *Media, surveillance and identity: Social perspectives* (pp. 71–88). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Malaby, T. M. (2007). Beyond play: A new approach to games. *Games and Culture, 2*, 95–113.

Marvasti, A. B. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology. An introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Marwick, A. E. (2012). The public domain: Social surveillance in everyday life. *Surveillance & Society, 9*, 378–393.

Mathiesen, T. (1997). The viewer society: Michel Foucault's "Panopticon" revisited. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*, 215–234.

May, T. (1997). *Social research. Issues, methods and process. Second edition*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

McGrath, J. E. (2004). *Loving Big Brother: Performance, privacy and surveillance space*. London: Routledge.

McGrath, J. E. (2012). Performing surveillance. In K. Ball, K. D. Haggerty, & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies* (pp. 83–90). London: Routledge.

Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (2004). The "inside" and the "outside": Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research. Theory,*

*method and practice. Second edition* (pp. 125–139). London: Sage Publications.

Monahan, T. (2010). *Surveillance in the time of insecurity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Monahan, T. (2011). Surveillance as cultural practice. *The Sociological Quarterly, 52,* 495–508.

Monahan, T., Phillips D. J., & Murakami Wood, D. (2010). Editorial. Surveillance and empowerment. *Surveillance & Society, 8*, 106–112.

Mäkinen, L. (2010). *Julkisen tilan kontrollin ulottuvuuksia: Tapaustutkimus Stop Töhryille -projektista*. University of Helsinki, Department of Social Research. Master's thesis.

Mäkinen, L. A. (2015). Katsaus tieliikenteen valvontaan ja amatöörivalvontaan Suomessa. *Liikenne, 2015*(1), 8–18.

Norris, C. (2012a). The success of failure. Accounting for the global growth of CCTV. In K. Ball, K.D. Haggerty & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies* (pp. 251–258). London: Routledge.

Norris, C. (2012b). There's no success like failure and failure's no success at all. Some critical reflections on understanding the global growth of CCTV surveillance. In A. Doyle, R. Lippert & D. Lyon (Eds.), *Eyes Everywhere. The Global Growth of Camera Surveillance* (pp. 23–45). New York: Routledge.

Ojala, E. (2010). *Yksityisyyden suoja työelämän kameravalvonnassa*. University of Lapland, Faculty of Social Sciences. Master's Thesis.

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Penguin.

Phillips, D. J. (2005). Identity in ubiquitous computing. *Social text, 23(2)*, 95–108.

Rapoport, M. (2012). The home under surveillance: A tripartite assemblage. *Surveillance & Society, 10,* 320–333.

Regan, P., & Steeves, V. (2010). Kids R Us: Online social networking and the potential for empowerment. *Surveillance & Society, 8,* 151–165.

Rose, N. (2000). Government and control. *British Journal of Criminology, 40,* 321–339.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematic of government. *British Journal of Sociology, 43*, 173–205.

Rule, J. B. (2007). *Privacy in peril*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schutt, R. K. (2006). *Investigating the social world. The process and practice of research. Fifth edition*. London: Sage.

Schön, D. J. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 254-283). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silber, I. F. (1995). Space, fields, boundaries: The rise of spatial metaphors in contemporary sociological theory. *Social Research, 62*, 323–355.

Smith, G. J. D. (2007). Exploring relations between watchers and watched in controll(ed) systems: Strategies and tactics. *Surveillance & Society, 4,* 280–313.

Stenros, J., Montola, M., & Mäyrä, F. (2007). Pervasive games in ludic society. *Proceedings of the 2007 conference on Future Play* (30–37). November 15–17, Toronto, Canada.

Svedberg, R. (2012). Theorizing in sociology and social sciences: Turning to the context of discovery. *Theory and Society, 41*, 1–40.

Tesch, R. (1991). Software for qualitative researchers: Analysis needs and program capabilities. In N.G. Fielding & R.M. Lee (Eds.), *Using computers in qualitative research (pp. 18–37)*. London: Sage Publications.

Trottier, D. (2014). Crowdsourcing CCTV surveillance on the Internet. *Information, Communication & Society, 17*, 609–626.

Troullinou, P. (2016) Coming to terms with seductive surveillance; Rationalization and resistance: A qualitative study on the subjective experience of surveillance through smartphone devices. *Presentation in the 7th Biannual Surveillance and Society Conference*. April 20–23, Barcelona, Spain.

Vuorensyrjä, M., & Fagerlund, M. (2016). *Poliisibarometri 2016. Kansalaisten käsitykset poliisin toiminnasta ja sisäisen turvallisuuden tilasta.* Sisäministeriön julkaisu 27/2016. Helsinki: Ministry of the Interior.

Weibel, P. (2002). Pleasure and the panoptic principle. In T.Y. Levin, U Frohne & P. Weibel (Eds.), *CTRL[SPACE]: Rhetorics of Surveillance from Bentham to Big Brother* (pp. 207–223). Karlsruhe: ZKM Centre for Art and Media.

Whitson, J. R. (2013). Gaming the quantified self. *Surveillance & Society, 11*, 163–176.

Wilkinson, S. (2004). Focus group research. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research. Theory, method and practice* (pp. 177–199). London: Sage.

Wise, J. M. (2004). An immense and unexpected field of action. Webcams, surveillance and everyday life. *Cultural Studies, 18*, 424–442.

Yee, N. (2006). The labor of fun: How video games blur the boundaries of work and play. *Games and Culture, 1*, 68–71.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods. Fourth edition.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1. Question form for data set 1: Interviews with student club camera users

**Background questions regarding the room and the interviewee**
How long have you studied/when did you study?
How long has the room been where it is? Where was it earlier?
What happens in the room?
Do you spend time in the room? How often? What do you do there?
At some point during the past few years there were some disturbances in the room and it was closed for a while. Can you tell me something about this? What is the situation now? Is the room now free of disturbances?
How is the room secured? Has this changed after installing the cameras?

**Camera system**
When were the cameras installed? Did they all come at once or one by one?
Who decided on the cameras? Did you participate in deciding? If yes, how did you feel about it? If no, when did you first hear about them? How did you react to them?
Why were they installed? Did the disturbances in the room affect the installation decision somehow? Was everyone in favour of the cameras? Was there any discussion about them? Any critical opinions? Was there any discussion about the rights and wrongs of using them?
Why were they situated in those exact locations? Who decided on it?
Is there any sign on the door regarding the cameras? Do you think there should be?
Do people ever discuss the cameras when they are in the room? Do you remember there ever being any discussion about the presence of these cameras?
How are the cameras used? Do you ever watch the feed in the room?
Do you yourself watch the feed from the cameras? If yes: When did you begin to do so? How often do you watch? What time of day do you watch? How long at once? Where do you watch? Why? What have you seen by means of the cameras? Any funny incidents? Does the watching lead to action? How? Is the watching communal? Do you watch alone or with someone? Has anyone ever encouraged you to watch? If no: Why not? Have you ever considered watching? Are you planning to watch now that I have asked about it? Has anyone ever encouraged you to watch?
Who do you think the cameras are meant for? Who do you think watches them? Do you know how many people watch these cameras? How popular do you think this watching is? Do you know anyone who watches them?

Who would you want to watch? Is there someone who you wouldn't want to watch? Would it trouble you if someone specific was watching? Who?

Has there ever been any malpractice in relation to using images from the cameras? Has anyone ever sabotaged the cameras, turned them away or something similar?

Has it ever been considered that the camera feed would not be open to all but would be, for instance, password protected? Would you want it to be password protected? Why/why not?

Are the cameras advertised anywhere? Do you tell about them to freshmen students, for instance?

Is anyone encouraged to watch the feed? Who does the encouraging? Who is encouraged? How does this happen and why?

**Feelings towards surveillance of the room and in general**

Do you watch webcams in general? If yes, which?

What do you think about the cameras when you are in the room? Do you think about them? Do you find them troubling? Do they have any effect on your behaviour?

Do they affect your decision to spend time in the room? Have you ever heard someone saying they have affected her or him? Do you know someone who would not want to go there because of the cameras? Or someone who would want to go there because of them? Has anyone ever complained about the cameras there?

Do you consider these cameras to be a form of surveillance? Why/why not? If yes, does that surveillance target people or property?

How do you define surveillance? What is surveillance?

How do you differentiate between a surveillance camera and a webcam? What is the difference or are there any differences?

Where do you feel it is okay to film people in general? Where would you rather not be filmed? Is there a difference depending on where the feed from the cameras is routed? If it were routed online? Or who is watching the feed? Would you mind if the feed from the room would go to a monitor room and not online?

## Appendix 2. Question form for data set 2: Interviews with boat club camera users

### Background information on the boat club and the interviewee

Describe your own boating history briefly: How long have you had a boat? How long have you been a member of this club?

Approximately how many members does the club have? How does this boat club differ (or does it differ) from other boat clubs in the area (or in general)? Are there some limits as to who is accepted as a member of this club?

Do you spend time at the boat club? How often? What do you do there?

### Securing and guarding the boat club:
### Volunteer guard system

Please describe in general how the boat club area is secured.

How does the volunteer guard system work? Can you tell a bit more about it?

How often is there guard duty? How long are the shifts? How are the volunteer guards trained/instructed? What do they do if something happens? Has anything ever happened?

Do the tasks only include patrolling outside the premises or are guard duties also conducted through the cameras? Have you heard that someone skipped their patrol duty by watching the cameras at home?

Is this a common way to conduct security in boat clubs? Why is security organized like this? Has it been organized like this from the beginning?

What do people in your opinion think about this volunteer duty? Are they pleased to do it? How do you yourself consider it? Do you think this system works well? Would you prefer it if you bought this service from an outside contractor?

### Boat club cameras

Please describe the camera system of the club. What kind of cameras are there? How many? Are they all recording? How long are the recordings saved?

Do you have information on how many viewers the system has? How popular do you think watching is? Do you know anyone who uses the cameras?

Have the cameras been there since the beginning of the club? Who decided on installing them? Were you a part of the decision-making process? If yes, where did you stand on the issue? If no, when did you first hear about the cameras? What did you think about them?

Why are the cameras there? Have the reasons changed over time? Who do you think the cameras are meant for? Who do you think watches them?

Do you watch the camera feed? If yes: Why? How often? What time of day do you watch? How long at once? Where do you watch? What have you seen by means of the cameras? Any funny incidents? Does the watching ever lead to action? What? Is the watching communal? Do you watch alone or with someone? If you do not watch, why not? Have you ever watched/considered watching? Are you planning to watch after this interview?

What in your view are the cameras used for? Have you heard that the cameras were ever used to film an incident or to capture criminals?

Does watching focus only on one's own property? Do people notify each other if they see something happening to another person's boat?

Has there ever been any malpractice about using the images from the cameras?

Is this type of surveillance common to boat clubs?

Is there a notification about the cameras at the gates?

What do you think about the cameras when you are at the club? Do you find them troubling? Do you ever think about being filmed there? Do they have any effect on your behaviour? Do they affect your decision to spend time at the club? Have you ever heard someone saying they were affected? Do you know someone who would not want to go there because of the cameras? Or that someone did not want to join the club because of the cameras or the volunteer guard system? Or do you know someone who wants to be there because they exist?

Has there ever been any discussion about them and the rights and wrongs of using them? Any critical opinions? Has anyone ever complained about them?

Do people ever discuss the cameras when they spend time at the boat club? Do they ever watch the feed when they are there?

Do you consider the cameras as surveillance? Why/why not? If yes, does that surveillance target people or property?

Which do you consider the more efficient method of surveillance: volunteer guards or the cameras?

Are all these cameras available online? If not, why not? Why are the cameras password protected? Couldn't the camera just as easily be open webcams?

Which do you consider more important: that the camera feed is available for all members or that it records events?

Is anyone encouraged to watch the feed? If yes: by whom? Who is encouraged, how and why? What kind of tasks do you think should and can be given to club members?

**Feelings towards surveillance at the boat club and in general**

How do you define surveillance? What is surveillance?

Do you watch webcams in general? If yes, which?

Do you think there are differences between surveillance cameras and webcams? What? Do you see a difference in the context of these boat club cameras? Do you consider these cameras to be webcams or surveillance cameras?

Where do you feel it is okay to film people? Where would you rather not be filmed? Is there a difference depending on where the feed from the cameras is routed (if routed online for instance)? Or who is watching the feed? If, for instance, the feed from a camera in a shopping mall was routed online instead of to a control room, would it matter to you?

## Appendix 3. Question form for data set 3: Interviews with home surveillance systems users

**Home and neighbourhood**
How long have you lived here? Who lives here with you?
Tell me something about this neighbourhood, describe it in your own words.

**Surveillance system**
You have a surveillance system here, could you tell me about it? How does it work? Does the system include cameras? How many? Is the feed routed to a security company/is it self-monitored? Are the cameras recording? How long are the recordings saved?
Is this the first surveillance system you have? When was the system installed? Who decided on installing it? What was your own opinion? Did the whole family participate in making the decision? Did you all agree? Why was the system installed? Had there been disturbances in your neighbourhood which affected the decision? Did your friends have similar systems? Or are there systems similar to yours in your neighbourhood? (If not mentioned: When installing the system did you think it would scare potential robbers away? Or that it would help catch them?)
Does the system make you feel safe?
How do you think the system achieves its purpose?
Practicalities: could you describe how you use this system in your everyday life? Is using the system problem-free? Does the system work as it should? (Do you use the system for surveillance or for other purposes?)
Specifics: How often do you watch? What time of day do you watch and for how long? Where do you watch? Why do you watch? Do you watch alone or with someone? Do you ever watch when you're at home? Does the watching ever lead to action? How and why? What have you seen by means of the cameras?
Are there signs warning about the system? Where? Who are they installed for?
How efficient do you see this system being as a surveillance method? (Is it able to deter? Can it be used to clarify incidents?) Has it been used to find out something or clarify an incident? Does it create a feeling of safety?
Some parents use their cameras to monitor and take care of their children, have you any experience on this?
Has anyone within the family been opposed to having this system?
Do you think the system targets people or property?
Is using this system different than what you thought when originally installing it? How?

**Feelings towards surveillance at home and in general**
Has installing the system had an effect on your general feelings regarding surveillance? How?
Do you consider yourself as pro-surveillance person?

How do you define surveillance? What is surveillance?

How do you differentiate between a surveillance camera and a webcam? What is the difference or are there any differences?

Where do you feel it is okay to film people? Where would you rather not be filmed? Is there a difference depending on where the feed from the cameras is routed? Or who is watching the feed? If, for instance, the feed from a camera in a shopping mall would be routed online instead of to a control room, would it matter to you?