

Statistical Bulletin

Crime and Justice Series

An Official Statistics Publication for Scotland

Key Scottish Safety Camera Programme Statistics, 2011 31 July 2012

Introduction

This bulletin presents provisional key statistics relating to the activity of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme for the calendar year 2011. The two main objectives of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme are:

- To reduce the number of people killed or injured on Scotland's roads through targeted camera enforcement at sites that meet criteria in force at the time they are established, and;
- To engender a culture of speed limit and red traffic signal compliance by providing a visible and effective deterrent¹.

The statistics contained within this bulletin describe:

- Accident and casualty numbers at safety camera sites, before and after camera enforcement.
- Speeds recorded at safety camera sites, before and after camera enforcement.
- The number of people caught exceeding the speed limit, or running red-lights, at safety camera sites.
- Public perception of safety cameras.

Summary of findings

- The number of people killed or seriously injured at safety camera sites is 68 per cent lower after camera enforcement. The number of personal injury accidents at safety camera sites is 48 per cent lower after enforcement (see pages 3 – 4).
- Changes in average speeds and the number of people exceeding the speed limit vary depending on speed limit and camera type (page 5).
- From 2009-10 there has been a 16 per cent increase in the number of people issued with a fixed penalty after being caught exceeding the speed limit or running a red-light at a safety camera site. This is a reduction of 21 per cent from 2007-08 figures (pages 6 – 7).
- Around 71 per cent of respondents to the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2010-11 agree that safety cameras help discourage dangerous driving and help prevent accidents. 82 per cent think that people should see the use of road safety cameras as a good thing (page 8)

¹ Scottish Safety Camera Programme Handbook, v1.2.1, March 2012.

Contents	Page
Introduction	1
Road Casualties	3
Speed	5
Offences	6
Public perception of safety cameras	8
Methodology	9
Annex A: Data by 3-year baselines	11
Annex B: Detailed findings from the Scottish Crime & Justice Survey 2010-11	15
Annex C: Revisions to the 2010 publication	19

Tables	Page
Table 1: Number of people killed or seriously injured at safety camera sites	3
Table 2: Number of people injured at safety camera sites	3
Table 3: Number of fatal or serious accidents at safety camera sites	4
Table 4: Number of personal injury accidents at safety camera sites	4
Table 5: Average speeds at safety camera sites	5
Table 6: Percentage above the speed limit at camera sites	5
Table 7: NIP and COFPN per financial year	6
Table A1: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1997 – 1999	11
Table A2: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1998 – 2000	11
Table A3: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1999 – 2001	12
Table A4: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2000 – 2002	12
Table A5: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2001 – 2003	12
Table A6: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2002 – 2004	13
Table A7: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2003 – 2005	13
Table A8: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2005 – 2007	13
Table B1: Agreement with the use of speed cameras on Scotland's roads	15
Table B2: Agreement with the use of red-light cameras on Scotland's roads	15
Table B3: Agreement that road safety cameras are an easy way of making money out of motorists	16
Table B4: Agreement that road safety cameras help prevent accidents	16
Table B5: Agreement that road safety cameras help discourage dangerous driving	17
Table B6: Agreement that people should see the use of road safety cameras as a good thing	17
Table B7: Agreement that there are too many road safety cameras	18
Table C1: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2003-2005	19

Road Casualties

Injury and fatality numbers before and after camera enforcement

Table 1: Number of people killed or seriously injured at safety camera sites

Cameras		Annual averages		
Type	Number ²	Baseline ³	Latest ⁴	Change ⁵
Fixed	166	92	36	-61%
Mobile	202	229	66	-71%
Red-Light	40	17	7	-60%
Total⁶	408	337	108	-68%

The average number of people killed or seriously injured, per year, at all camera sites has decreased by 68 per cent when comparing the most recent 3-year average with the baseline 3-year average. This is a reduction in the average number of people killed or seriously injured from 337 to 108 per year.

The largest change is at mobile camera sites where the average number of people killed or seriously injured has fallen from 229 to 66 per year (-71%).

Table 2: Number of people injured at safety camera sites

Cameras		Annual averages		
Type	Number	Baseline	Latest	Change
Fixed	164	490	278	-43%
Mobile	201	753	341	-55%
Red-Light	40	157	65	-59%
Total	405	1,400	684	-51%

The average number of people injured (including people killed and seriously injured), per year, at all camera sites has decreased by 51 per cent when comparing the most recent 3-year average with the baseline 3-year average. This is a reduction in the average number of people injured from 1,400 to 684 per year.

The largest actual change is at mobile camera sites where the average number of people injured has fallen from 753 to 341 per year (-55%). The largest proportional change has been at red-light camera sites where the average number of people injured has fallen by 59 per cent, from 157 to 65 per year.

² The number of cameras operational at the end of 2011, with three full years' enforcement data, and for which distinct baseline data is available – see [methodology notes 5 to 9](#)

³ Annual average based on 3-year baselines – see [methodology note 5](#)

⁴ Annual average for the period 2009 to 2011 inclusive – see [methodology note 9](#)

⁵ Reported percentage changes may not exactly match the reported numerical change as a result of rounding

⁶ Totals may not exactly match the sum of component values as a result of rounding

Accident numbers before and after camera enforcement

Table 3: Number of fatal or serious accidents at safety camera sites

Cameras		Annual averages		
Type	Number	Baseline	Latest	Change
Fixed	165	79	33	-58%
Mobile	215	193	59	-69%
Red-Light	40	14	6	-56%
Total	420	286	98	-66%

The average number of fatal or serious accidents, per year, at all camera sites has reduced by 66 per cent when comparing the most recent 3-year average with the baseline 3-year average. This equates to a decrease in the average number of fatal or serious accidents from 286 to 98 per year.

The largest change is at mobile camera sites where the average number of fatal or serious accidents has fallen from 193 to 59 per year (-69%).

Table 4: Number of personal injury accidents at safety camera sites

Cameras		Annual averages		
Type	Number	Baseline	Latest	Change
Fixed	167	384	229	-40%
Mobile	216	553	269	-51%
Red-Light	40	117	49	-58%
Total	423	1,054	547	-48%

The average number of personal injury accidents (including fatal and serious accidents), per year, at all camera sites has decreased by 48 per cent when comparing the most recent 3-year average with the baseline 3-year average. This is a reduction in the average number of personal injury accidents from 1,054 to 547 per year.

The largest actual change is at mobile camera sites where the average number of personal injury accidents has fallen from 553 to 269 per year (-51%). The largest proportional change has been at red-light camera sites where the average number of personal injury accidents has fallen by 58 per cent, from 117 to 49 per year.

Speed⁷

Table 5: Average speeds at safety camera sites

Speed Limit	Mobile			Fixed		
	Sites	Baseline ⁸	Current	Sites	Baseline	Current
30 mph	76	33 mph	31 mph	87	31 mph	26 mph
40 mph	8	44 mph	39 mph	11	35 mph	35 mph
50 mph	7	51 mph	46 mph	3	47 mph	47 mph
60 mph	77	56 mph	54 mph	39	53 mph	53 mph
70 mph	19	69 mph	65 mph	19	67 mph	63 mph

The most recently recorded average speeds at mobile camera sites are lower than the baselines recorded for all speed limits. At fixed camera sites current average speeds are below or equal to baseline levels at all sites. In most cases, current average speeds at fixed and mobile camera sites are below the posted speed limit; the exception is 30-mph mobile camera sites.

Table 6: Percentage above the speed limit at camera sites

Speed limit	Mobile		Fixed	
	Baseline	Current	Baseline	Current
30 mph	63%	49%	45%	14%
40 mph	64%	27%	18%	22%
50 mph	58%	36%	25%	27%
60 mph	30%	22%	12%	17%
70 mph	58%	23%	33%	26%

For mobile camera sites there has been a reduction in the percentage of vehicles recorded as travelling above the speed limit for all speed categories, while for fixed camera sites there has been a reduction at 30- and 70-mph sites, and an increase at 40-, 50- and 60-mph sites.

Just over half of all fixed camera sites are sited on 30-mph roads. The relatively low numbers on roads with other speed limits means that comparison of findings for different speed limits are unlikely to yield significant results. Similarly, comparison between fixed and mobile sites is not appropriate for anything other than 30-mph sites. However, at 30-mph sites there are greater reductions in the average speed and percentage above the speed limit at fixed camera sites.

⁷ Speed is not continuously monitored at all camera sites – these figures are based on the most recent speed surveys carried out at camera sites, as at 31 December 2011.

⁸ Variations in baseline figures from last year reflect changes in the number of cameras included in the sample.

Offences

The images taken when a safety camera is activated are reviewed to confirm that an identifiable offence has occurred. Once satisfied that the camera has detected a speeding, or red-light traffic offence, a Notice of Intended Prosecution (NIP) is sent to the registered keeper of the vehicle. The registered keeper is legally obliged to provide information to identify the driver of the vehicle at the time of the alleged offence to the police.

Where appropriate an alleged offender is issued with a Conditional Offer of a Fixed Penalty Notice (COFPN). Alternatively they may be reported directly to the procurator fiscal for consideration of a prosecution.

Audited details of the number of NIP sent to registered keepers, COFPN issued and the number of COFPN paid in each financial year from 2001-02 to 2010-11 are reproduced in the following table⁹.

Table 7: NIP and COFPN per financial year

Year	NIP issued	COFPN issued	Cumulative %: COFPN / NIP	COFPN paid	Cumulative %: paid / issued
01-02 ¹⁰	73,700	32,678	44.3%	28,982	88.7%
02-03 ¹¹	67,736	43,893	54.1%	39,496	89.4%
03-04 ¹²	169,147	132,295	67.2%	115,791	88.2%
04-05 ¹³	199,572	161,574	72.6%	144,235	88.7%
05-06	164,785	127,374	73.8%	113,566	88.8%
06-07 ¹⁴	170,020	127,607	74.0%	114,107	88.9%
07-08	120,474	92,722	74.4%	88,427	89.8%
08-09	94,861	70,906	74.4%	60,139	89.3%
09-10	79,922	62,832	74.7%	54,645	89.1%
10-11	90,174	72,868	75.2%	62,011	88.8%

⁹ These figures only include cameras operated under the auspices of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme, and do not include any other notices or penalties issued, including any issued as a result of detections by cameras operated outwith the programme.

¹⁰ Strathclyde partnership only – includes only 1 local authority.

¹¹ Fife partnership formed in April 2002. North-East partnership formed in October 2002. Strathclyde expands to include 4 local authorities.

¹² D&G, L&B and Tayside partnerships formed in July 2003. Strathclyde expands to include all local authorities in the region.

¹³ Northern partnership formed in July 2004. L&B expands to include all local authorities in the region.

¹⁴ Central partnership formed in April 2006.

Over the last few years, around 75 per cent of NIP resulted in the issuing of a COFPN. For many of the partnerships the proportion of NIP to COFPN was lower in their first years of operation than in subsequent years. Several factors may have contributed to this proportional change, including improvements to working practices, and the allocation of police resources to track down offenders who seek to evade detection. The number of camera sites being enforced will also influence the number of NIP issued each year. These include temporary camera sites at road works and camera sites that don't otherwise qualify for inclusion elsewhere in the bulletin.

The issue of a NIP will not always lead to the issuing of a COFPN. For example, a COFPN will not be issued in those instances where the registered keeper is reported to the procurator fiscal for failing to provide details of the driver. Offenders driving at excessively high speeds are also reported directly to the procurator fiscal and a COFPN will not be issued in this case. Emergency service vehicles, responding to an emergency call, may activate a safety camera; a COFPN will not be issued in these circumstances if an exemption is claimed by the driver and is accepted. These examples are merely illustrative, and there are other legitimate circumstances in which the issue of a NIP will not lead to the issue of a COFPN.

Public perception of safety cameras¹⁵

As part of the 2010-11 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey, data were collected regarding public perceptions of, and attitudes toward, safety cameras. 3,249 respondents were asked whether they agree with the use of speed cameras (76% agree) and red-light cameras (88% agree) on Scotland's roads. They were also asked whether they agree or disagree with the following statements:

- Road safety cameras are an easy way of making money out of motorists (59% agree)
- Road safety cameras help prevent accidents (70% agree)
- Road safety cameras help discourage dangerous driving (71% agree)
- People should see the use of road safety cameras as a good thing (82% agree)
- There are too many road safety cameras (48% disagree)

From these results it seems that understanding of the purpose of safety cameras is mixed. More people agree that safety cameras help to prevent accidents, discourage dangerous driving and are a good thing than disagree with those statements. However, more than half agree with the statement that safety cameras are an easy way to make money from motorists. And while more people disagree with the statement that there are too many cameras than agree with that statement, a large group of responders were undecided¹⁶ (22%). The responses to this last statement were clearly and significantly different across age groups and between genders ($p < 0.001$), with a greater percentage of males than females agreeing that there are too many cameras. People aged 16 to 24 were most undecided about this question, with 29% of males of this age expressing neither agreement nor disagreement with this statement.

Overall, 76% of respondents stated that they agree with the use of speed cameras on Scotland's roads (17% disagree, the remainder undecided). Females were more likely to agree (83%) than males (67%) while those aged 45 to 59 were less likely to agree (70%) than those aged 16 to 24 (80%), 25 to 44 (75%) or 60 and over (79%).

The gender difference and age difference are both statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The most support for the use of speed cameras came from females aged 16 to 24 (88%) while the least support came from males aged 45 to 59 (60%). These differences between combination age-gender groups are also statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

Support for red-light cameras was greater across all responder groups. 67% of the total agree strongly with the use of red-light cameras, along with a further 21% that agree slightly (making 88% overall agreement). Differences between age, gender and combination age-gender groups were all statistically significant, with older females showing more agreement than younger males.

¹⁵ See methodology [note 3](#), [note 4](#) and [note 10](#)

¹⁶ 'undecided' includes the responses 'refused', 'don't know' and 'neither agree nor disagree'

Methodology

Sources

1. All data relating to safety camera operations, including enforcement periods, recorded speeds at sites, and accident and injury numbers at sites, have been taken from the Scottish Safety Camera Programme database. This is an administrative data source used by all the safety camera partnerships to record data related to collisions, casualties and enforcement at all types of safety camera site operated by the partnerships. The data was extracted from the database on 31 May 2012.
2. Data relating to offences (NIP and COFPN) was compiled from audited figures supplied by the eight regional safety camera partnerships.
3. Information regarding public perception of safety cameras was taken from the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2010-11.
4. Respondent characteristics recorded by the 2010-11 Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) include age, gender, the urban/rural classification of responders' homes, victim status, socio-economic group, tenure and the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) of their home. Age, gender and the urban/rural classification of the responders' homes are considered to be the most pertinent characteristics in this analysis. Analyses of other SCJS questions and data tables of all the SCJS responses are available via the Scottish Government website at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/Browse/Crime-Justice/Publications/publications>.

Baseline data

5. With the formation of the Scottish Safety Camera Programme, partnerships have been required to collect data on road casualties at proposed camera sites for a period of 3 years prior to the start of camera enforcement. This forms the baseline against which camera effectiveness can be assessed. Due to the different enforcement periods of cameras throughout Scotland, the baseline data for all cameras do not come from the same period. For the purpose of the summary analyses on pages 3 and 4, the "baseline" annual averages refer to the baseline data collected for each camera and not to a fixed period in time. It is the sum of all the relevant baseline data divided by 3 to give an estimate of the mean annual accident/injury numbers across all safety camera sites.
6. There were no standard baseline data requirements for safety camera sites installed outwith the Scottish Safety Camera Programme. However, some baseline data were collected for some of these camera sites. With the formation of various partnerships over the last decade, many of these 'pre-programme' sites have been adopted by the programme. For the purposes of the analyses in this report only those cameras that have some measure of baseline data, and that were being enforced at the end of 2011, have been included. Cameras without the full range of baseline data have been included only in those sections relating to the measures for which data are recorded – for example, the

requirement to record the number of people killed or seriously injured pre-dates the requirement to record the number of injuries of all severity.

7. No data for cameras with a baseline period later than 2006-2008 have been included in these figures. This is to ensure that the baseline does not overlap with the latest 3-year period measured, as this would lead to figures being counted twice. Only cameras with at least 3 full years' post-baseline data have been included (ie: no cameras with an enforcement commencement date later than 31 December 2008).
8. Prior to publication all data undergoes quality assurance by the relevant local authorities, however due to operational restrictions in some instances this has not been completed. In line with our policy, any minor revisions will be highlighted in next year's publication. If there are significant revisions to the data the current bulletin will be reissued at a later date.
9. The "latest" annual averages refer to the data collected for the fixed 3-year period of 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2011 inclusive. This is the latest period for which three full calendar years' data is available. The data is added together and divided by 3 to provide an estimate of the current mean annual accident/injury numbers across all safety camera sites.

Public perceptions

10. The chi-square test was used to test for significant differences between respondent groups. The p-values for all tests are shown in the tables at [Annex B](#).

Revisions

11. Some of the data used in this bulletin differs slightly from that used in Key Scottish Safety Camera Programme Statistics 2010. This is a result of additional quality checks being carried out on the data leading to adjustment (eg: corrections made to the grid references attached to incident locations may move them in or out of camera sites), and/or reclassification of some incidents (eg: serious injuries later proving fatal). A summary of the changes is provided in [Annex C](#).

Annex A: Data by 3-year baselines

The following tables show the changes in the 3-year average accident and casualty numbers between baseline periods and the period from 2009 to 2011 inclusive. The tables are grouped by baseline periods.

The tables include data for all cameras that were enforced at the end of 2011, including those where enforcement commenced pre-programme. Therefore, consistent baseline data are not available for all cameras¹⁷. The effect of this is to reduce the 3-year average baseline figures for all injuries and accidents. This, in turn, means that any reported reductions are under-estimates of the true reduction and any reported increases are over-estimates of the true increase.

Baseline years 1997 – 1999

There are 26 fixed cameras and 19 red-light cameras with a baseline period of 1997 to 1999 that are currently still enforced¹⁸.

Table A1: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1997 – 1999

	3-year averages			
	KSI ¹⁹	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	24.3	174.7	129.7	22.0
Latest ²⁰	9.7	81.3	64.3	9.3
Percentage change	-60%	-53%	-50%	-58%

Baseline years 1998 – 2000

There are 4 fixed cameras, 25 mobile cameras and 2 red-light cameras with a baseline period of 1998 to 2000 that are currently enforced.

Table A2: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1998 – 2000

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	40.7	153.7	102.7	30.3
Latest	11.7	68.3	53.7	11.0
Percentage change	-71%	-56%	-48%	-64%

¹⁷ See [methodology note 6](#)

¹⁸ Throughout this annex 'currently enforced' means enforced as at 31 December 2011

¹⁹ KSI = killed/seriously injured; ASI = all severity injuries; PIA = personal injury accident; FSA = fatal/serious accident

²⁰ See [methodology note 9](#)

Baseline years 1999 – 2001

There are 59 fixed cameras, 23 mobile cameras and 1 red-light camera with a baseline period of 1999 to 2001 that are currently enforced.

Table A3: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 1999 – 2001

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	67.3	278.3	221.0	57.3
Latest	35.0	167.0	127.7	30.3
Percentage change	-48%	-40%	-42%	-47%

Baseline years 2000 – 2002

There are 67 fixed cameras, 119 mobile cameras and 16 red-light cameras with a baseline period of 2000 to 2002 that are currently enforced.

Table A4: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2000 – 2002

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	164.0	660.7	476.3	132.0
Latest	62.7	352.0	276.3	54.0
Percentage change	-62%	-47%	-42%	-59%

Baseline years 2001 – 2003

There are 2 fixed cameras, 29 mobile cameras and 2 red-light cameras with a baseline period of 2001 to 2003 that are currently enforced.

Table A5: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2001 – 2003

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	19.7	72.7	68.3	22.7
Latest	6.3	46.7	37.0	6.3
Percentage change	-68%	-36%	-46%	-72%

Baseline years 2002 – 2004

There are 2 fixed cameras and 7 mobile cameras with a baseline period of 2002 to 2004 that are currently enforced.

Table A6: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2002 – 2004

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	7.0	17.3	20.0	8.0
Latest	1.7	8.3	8.0	1.7
Percentage change	-76%	-52%	-60%	-79%

Baseline years 2003 – 2005

There are 10 mobile cameras and 1 fixed camera with a baseline period of 2003 to 2005 that are currently enforced.

Table A7: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2003 – 2005

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	9.0	24.3	26.0	9.0
Latest	2.0	16.7	11.7	2.0
Percentage change	-78%	-32%	-55%	-78%

Baseline years 2004 – 2006

There are no mobile cameras with a baseline period of 2004 to 2006 that are currently enforced.

Baseline years 2005 – 2007

There are 6 fixed cameras and 3 mobile cameras with a baseline period of 2005 to 2007 that are currently enforced.

Table A8: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2005 – 2007

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	5.3	18.7	10.0	4.3
Latest	0.7	3.7	3.3	0.7
Percentage change	-88%	-80%	-67%	-85%

Baseline years 2006 – 2008

There are 2 mobile cameras and 1 fixed camera with a baseline period of 2006 to 2008 that are currently enforced. However, these cameras do not have three full years' post-baseline data, as they were all enforced from April 2009. Therefore they are all excluded from the analyses herein.

Baseline years 2007 – 2009, 2008 – 2010 and 2009 - 2011

The baseline periods for these three sets of cameras overlap with the latest 3-year period, so comparative averages cannot yet be calculated.

Annex B: Detailed findings from the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey 2010-11²¹

Table B1: Agreement with the use of speed cameras on Scotland's roads

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		Urban	Rural				
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+			16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+
Agree	76%	67%	83%	80%	75%	70%	79%	70%	65%	60%	76%	88%	84%	80%	82%	77%	70%
Agree strongly	47%	37%	55%	49%	44%	45%	51%	39%	32%	35%	47%	57%	56%	56%	54%	48%	41%
Agree slightly	29%	30%	28%	31%	31%	25%	28%	32%	34%	25%	29%	31%	29%	25%	28%	29%	29%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%	7%	6%	4%	7%	7%	5%	6%	8%	8%	4%	3%	6%	6%	6%	6%	8%
Disagree	17%	25%	9%	13%	17%	22%	13%	21%	26%	31%	19%	7%	9%	13%	9%	16%	21%
Disagree slightly	8%	11%	5%	5%	8%	11%	6%	8%	11%	14%	9%	2%	5%	7%	4%	7%	11%
Disagree strongly	9%	14%	5%	9%	10%	11%	7%	13%	15%	17%	11%	4%	4%	6%	4%	9%	11%
Refused	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	1%	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	*	1%	2%	*	1%	4%	1%	1%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$					

' - ' indicates that no respondents gave an answer in the category; ' * ' indicates a response rate of less than 0.5%

Table B2: Agreement with the use of red-light cameras on Scotland's roads

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		Urban	Rural				
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+			16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+
Agree	88%	87%	89%	88%	88%	88%	89%	84%	85%	86%	90%	91%	90%	90%	87%	89%	85%
Agree strongly	67%	64%	69%	67%	64%	66%	70%	63%	60%	63%	72%	71%	68%	70%	69%	67%	65%
Agree slightly	21%	23%	20%	21%	24%	22%	19%	21%	25%	24%	19%	21%	22%	20%	18%	22%	20%
Neither agree nor disagree	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%	7%	5%	5%	4%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%
Disagree	5%	7%	4%	5%	6%	6%	4%	6%	8%	8%	5%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%
Disagree slightly	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	5%	5%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	4%
Disagree strongly	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Refused	*	*	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	5%	2%	4%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = 0.009$				$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$					

²¹ See methodology [note 3](#) and [note 4](#)

Table B3: Agreement that road safety cameras are an easy way of making money out of motorists

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Urban	Rural
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+						
Agree	59%	69%	50%	51%	61%	63%	57%	60%	73%	71%	65%	42%	50%	54%	51%	58%	63%
Agree strongly	34%	44%	26%	24%	35%	40%	33%	29%	45%	51%	41%	20%	24%	29%	27%	33%	38%
Agree slightly	25%	25%	25%	26%	27%	23%	24%	31%	28%	20%	23%	22%	25%	26%	24%	25%	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	11%	9%	12%	17%	10%	8%	10%	14%	8%	7%	9%	20%	13%	9%	11%	11%	9%
Disagree	27%	21%	33%	29%	26%	27%	27%	23%	18%	20%	25%	34%	35%	34%	29%	27%	26%
Disagree slightly	13%	12%	15%	16%	13%	13%	13%	16%	10%	11%	13%	17%	16%	15%	13%	14%	11%
Disagree strongly	14%	9%	18%	13%	13%	14%	14%	7%	8%	8%	12%	17%	19%	19%	16%	14%	14%
Refused	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	3%	2%	5%	4%	2%	2%	6%	3%	1%	2%	1%	4%	3%	3%	9%	3%	3%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = 0.160$					

Table B4: Agreement that road safety cameras help prevent accidents

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Urban	Rural
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+						
Agree	70%	73%	70%	66%	69%	74%	61%	61%	65%	74%	77%	70%	74%	74%	76%	71%	63%
Agree strongly	34%	37%	33%	32%	34%	35%	25%	28%	30%	35%	40%	35%	38%	35%	40%	35%	27%
Agree slightly	36%	37%	37%	34%	35%	39%	36%	33%	34%	39%	38%	35%	36%	39%	36%	36%	37%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	8%	9%	10%	7%	7%	13%	9%	8%	7%	6%	11%	7%	8%	6%	8%	10%
Disagree	19%	13%	18%	22%	21%	14%	26%	29%	26%	17%	11%	15%	15%	11%	12%	18%	22%
Disagree slightly	11%	8%	12%	13%	12%	9%	17%	17%	14%	11%	8%	9%	9%	7%	8%	10%	15%
Disagree strongly	7%	5%	6%	9%	9%	5%	9%	12%	12%	6%	3%	6%	6%	3%	4%	7%	7%
Refused	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	*	*	0%	*	*
Don't know	3%	5%	3%	3%	2%	5%	-	2%	1%	2%	6%	3%	3%	7%	7%	3%	4%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = 0.001$					

Table B5: Agreement that road safety cameras help discourage dangerous driving

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Urban	Rural
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+						
Agree	71%	68%	74%	76%	68%	71%	73%	69%	65%	68%	71%	83%	72%	74%	74%	73%	66%
Agree strongly	36%	33%	38%	39%	31%	37%	38%	29%	29%	35%	38%	47%	34%	39%	38%	37%	29%
Agree slightly	36%	35%	36%	37%	37%	34%	35%	40%	37%	33%	33%	35%	38%	35%	36%	35%	36%
Neither agree nor disagree	5%	5%	5%	2%	5%	5%	6%	3%	5%	4%	6%	2%	5%	5%	5%	5%	6%
Disagree	22%	26%	18%	20%	25%	23%	17%	27%	30%	27%	21%	14%	21%	19%	14%	22%	25%
Disagree slightly	12%	14%	10%	12%	13%	12%	10%	16%	15%	13%	12%	9%	11%	10%	8%	11%	15%
Disagree strongly	10%	13%	8%	8%	12%	11%	8%	11%	15%	14%	10%	5%	10%	9%	6%	10%	11%
Refused	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	2%	7%	2%	2%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = 0.044$					

Table B6: Agreement that people should see the use of road safety cameras as a good thing

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Urban	Rural
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+						
Agree	82%	75%	88%	85%	79%	80%	85%	75%	72%	73%	82%	93%	87%	87%	88%	84%	75%
Agree strongly	49%	41%	56%	49%	45%	48%	54%	36%	36%	41%	51%	59%	53%	56%	56%	50%	45%
Agree slightly	33%	34%	32%	36%	35%	32%	32%	38%	36%	33%	31%	34%	33%	31%	32%	34%	30%
Neither agree nor disagree	7%	9%	6%	7%	9%	8%	6%	12%	12%	8%	6%	2%	6%	7%	6%	7%	10%
Disagree	9%	14%	5%	7%	11%	12%	7%	12%	15%	18%	12%	2%	7%	6%	4%	9%	13%
Disagree slightly	5%	8%	2%	5%	6%	6%	3%	9%	8%	10%	5%	1%	4%	2%	1%	4%	8%
Disagree strongly	4%	6%	3%	2%	4%	6%	4%	3%	6%	8%	6%	1%	2%	4%	2%	4%	5%
Refused	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	*	2%	1%	*	2%	1%	1%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$					

Table B7: Agreement that there are too many road safety cameras

	Total	GENDER		AGE				AGE/GENDER				URBAN/RURAL					
		Male	Female	16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Male		Female		16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+	Urban	Rural
								16 - 24	25 - 44	45 - 59	60+						
Agree	29%	37%	22%	22%	30%	34%	26%	33%	38%	43%	32%	13%	23%	25%	21%	28%	32%
Agree strongly	16%	21%	11%	11%	17%	19%	13%	17%	23%	25%	17%	6%	12%	13%	10%	15%	17%
Agree slightly	13%	16%	11%	11%	13%	15%	13%	15%	15%	18%	15%	7%	11%	12%	11%	13%	15%
Neither agree nor disagree	16%	17%	16%	24%	16%	15%	14%	29%	17%	15%	13%	19%	16%	15%	15%	16%	16%
Disagree	48%	42%	55%	48%	48%	47%	50%	31%	41%	39%	51%	61%	56%	55%	50%	49%	45%
Disagree slightly	21%	20%	22%	23%	22%	19%	21%	18%	23%	15%	21%	27%	20%	22%	21%	21%	19%
Disagree strongly	28%	22%	33%	25%	27%	29%	30%	13%	18%	24%	31%	34%	35%	33%	28%	28%	26%
Refused	*	*	*	*	*	-	*	1%	-	-	-	-	*	-	*	*	*
Don't know	6%	4%	8%	6%	5%	4%	10%	6%	4%	3%	4%	6%	6%	4%	14%	6%	6%
χ^2 probabilities		$p = <0.001$		$p = <0.001$				$p = <0.001$				$p = 0.185$					

Annex C: Revisions to the 2010 publication

As noted in the [methodology](#), some slight amendments to the data used in last year's publication have since been made to improve accuracy.

The following tables show how Table A7 as published in July 2010, would have looked using this corrected data.

Table C1: Accident and casualty averages for camera sites with baseline years 2003 – 2005

	3-year averages			
	KSI	ASI	PIA	FSA
Baseline	9.3	26.7	27.7	9.3
Latest	2.3	16.0	12.0	2.3
Percentage change	-75%	-40%	-57%	-75%

Camera sites reviewed during 2011

During the course of 2011, 139 safety camera sites were reviewed in accordance with the programme's handbook of rules and guidance. As a result of these reviews 3 sites were abandoned, all within the NESCamp region.

There were 9 sites that became enforced during 2008 that would have been excluded from the analyses in last year's bulletin as there were not three full years' post-baseline data available but are included in this bulletin.

AN OFFICIAL STATISTICS PUBLICATION FOR SCOTLAND

Official and National Statistics are produced to high professional standards set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics at <http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/assessment/code-of-practice/code-of-practice-for-official-statistics.pdf>. Both undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs and are produced free from any political interference.

Statistics assessed, or subject to assessment, by the UK Statistics Authority carry the National Statistics label, a stamp of assurance that the statistics have been produced and explained to high standards and that they serve the public good.

Further information about Official and National Statistics can be found on the UK Statistics Authority website at www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk

SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT STATISTICIAN GROUP

Our Aim

To provide relevant and reliable information, analysis and advice that meet the needs of government, business and the people of Scotland.

For more information on the Statistician Group, please see the Scottish Government website at www.scotland.gov.uk/statistics

Correspondence and enquiries

Enquiries on this publication should be addressed to:

Alison McLeary
Scottish Safety Camera Programme
4th Floor, Highlander House
58 Waterloo Street
Glasgow G2 7DA
Telephone: (0141) 271 3803;
Fax: (0141) 221 5030
e-mail: safety.cameras@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

General enquiries on Scottish Government statistics can be addressed to:

Office of the Chief Statistician
Scottish Government
1N.04, St Andrews House
EDINBURGH EH1 3DG
Telephone: (0131) 244 0442
e-mail: statistics.enquiries@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Further contact details, e-mail addresses and details of previous and forthcoming publications can be found on the Scottish Government Website at www.scotland.gov.uk/statistics

Complaints and suggestions

If you are not satisfied with our service, please write to the Chief Statistician, Mr Roger Halliday, 1N.04, St Andrews House, Edinburgh, EH1 3DG, Telephone: (0131) 244 0302, e-mail roger.halliday@scotland.gsi.gov.uk. We also welcome any comments or suggestions that would help us to improve our standards of service.

ScotStat

If you would like to be consulted about new or existing statistical collections or receive notification of forthcoming statistical publications, please register your interest on the Scottish Government ScotStat website at www.scotland.gov.uk/scotstat

Crown Copyright

Brief extracts from the Crown Copyright material in this publication may be reproduced provided the source is fully acknowledged.

ISBN: 978-1-78045-947-9 (web only)

APS Group Scotland
DPPAS13185 (07/12)