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I. INTRODUCTION TO THE CAMPAIGN

I. 1. The nature of the campaign

In December 1992 Edinburgh District Council Women’s Committee [EDCWC] launched a campaign aimed to raise public awareness of the extent and nature of violence against women. The campaign publicised facts and figures about violence against women and sought to impress upon the public that such violence should not be tolerated. The initiative was called ‘The Zero Tolerance Campaign’. Part of the campaign involved the four posters shown below [see Fig 1-4]. These were displayed on billboards and adshell display sites throughout Edinburgh as well as in indoor sites such as public houses, libraries, community and recreation centres. Subsequently, other statements were sited on large, prominent placards in Edinburgh’s main shopping street. These included statements such as; ‘85% of rapists are men known to the victim’; ‘Male abuse of Power is a Crime’; and ‘No Man has the Right’. [see Fig 5-6]. In addition to the main advertisements two thousand copies of a general leaflet outlining the campaign’s aims were distributed via recreation outlets etc; one thousand ‘Zero Tolerance’ bookmarks were distributed via city libraries; and one thousand postcard packs describing the campaign were sent out to those seeking further information about the campaign. The local daily newspaper, the “Evening News”, also ran a series of feature and news articles on each of the subjects addressed by the posters. ¹

The Zero Tolerance campaign is on-going: a new poster is to be launched in January 1994. This report, however, is based on an evaluation of the first six months of the public awareness initiative (from December 1992 to May 1993).

I. 2. The origins of the campaign

The Zero Tolerance public awareness campaign was developed in consultation with groups working with victims/survivors of domestic violence, rape, sexual assault and child sexual abuse and drew on research undertaken by the District Council Women’s Unit staff into initiatives undertaken in the rest of the UK and abroad (e.g Canada). ² It was also developed in response to the findings of two commissioned research projects:

(a) The ‘Women’s Consultation Exercise’ - which identified the main issues of concern to the majority of women in Edinburgh as: child care, access to training and employment and violence against women. (Stevenson, 1990)

(b) The study of ‘Adolescents’ knowledge about, and attitudes to, domestic violence’. One of the recommendations of which was that Edinburgh District Council undertake a public awareness campaign on violence against women. (Falchikov, 1992)

¹ The EDCWC also hosted a public meeting, in response to requests from individual women in Edinburgh, to enable them to meet and discuss the setting up of a group to campaign on issues of violence against women. An independent women’s group called ‘Stand-Up’ is now active in Edinburgh. The District council is also involved in funding some direct service provisions for women who have been subjected to violence and the Women’s Committee ran a ‘Safer Streets for Women’ campaign jointly with Edinburgh’s taxi trade during 1992.
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I. 3. The aims of the campaign

The general long term aims of the Zero Tolerance Campaign are to:

— generate debate and focus on strategies to prevent crimes of violence against women and children,
— highlight the need for adequate support services,
— highlight the need for appropriate legal protection for women and children victims/survivors of violence.

The specific objectives of the initial six months of the campaign were to:

— highlight the prevalence of the various crimes of violence against women and children, linking these crimes as part of a continuum of male abuse of power.
— promote a crimilisation strategy and send out a clear message that these forms of violence should not be tolerated.
— debunk some of the myths around these crimes. For example the campaign material targeted the myth that such crimes are only perpetrated by working class men against working class women, that they are mainly attacks by strangers out of doors and that they only happen to certain women because of their age, appearance, dress or behaviour.

---

2 Since 1992 Ontario has run a public awareness campaign as part of their Sexual Assault Prevention campaign, involving TV, radio and press advertisements, posters, badges and other promotional materials. They have also run a public education campaign aimed at ‘wife assault prevention’. (Westmount Research Consultants Inc., 1992)
II. INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH REPORT

This report presents a basic summary of the evaluation of the Zero Tolerance Campaign, followed by a more in-depth discussion of the data. The entire report is designed to:

(a) assess the public's overall evaluation of the campaign, including reactions to Edinburgh spearheading a campaign of this sort and the perceived need for, and acceptability of, advertisements around violence.
(b) provide sufficient detail about the impact of the Zero Tolerance advertisements to be useful to those wishing to adopt the campaign elsewhere or intending to develop similar material.

The report is based on:
(a) A street survey of a representative sample of 228 people in Edinburgh.
(b) Focus group discussions with 11 different groups from the city, supplemented by more limited discussions with a further 6 groups in and around Glasgow. Each group involved about half-a-dozen participants and the sessions were tape-recorded. Focus groups are guided group discussions which make use of the interaction between members of the group in order to explore their views and attitudes (Morely, 1988; Kitzinger, 1994). The discussion sessions were designed to provide more in-depth qualitative information about people’s responses to the campaign. The group sessions produced detailed feedback about people’s feelings about each individual advertisement and identified areas of criticism or praise for the campaign which were not addressed in the survey.

Note: The street survey aimed to represent the views of the general population, whereas the focus groups were selected in order to explore a range of opinions. For example, some groups were chosen because they had a special interest in, or knowledge about, violence while other groups were selected specifically to try to elicit negative views. Throughout the report all statistical data is drawn from the street survey and those research subjects are referred to as 'respondents'. People who were interviewed in-depth as part of a group are referred to as group or research 'participants', and there is no attempt to quantify these latter data beyond the broad use of terms such as 'most' or 'some'.
III. SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

III. 1. Summary of Main Findings from the Street Survey

• There was a generally positive public response to the Zero Tolerance Campaign. This is evident in the responses to 3 different questions:
  (a) 33% of those asked described their feelings about the Campaign as ‘very positive’ and a further 46% as ‘quite positive’. Just 6% described their feelings as negative (5% ‘quite’ and 1% ‘very negative’).
  (b) Almost 80% agreed with the statement that “Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse”; only 4% disagreed.
  (c) 11% of respondents agreed with the statement that “The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image”. However, two thirds of people disagreed with the statement (35% ‘strongly’ and 31% ‘just’ disagreed).

• Further support for the Campaign is demonstrated by the facts that:
  (a) There seemed to be little antipathy to the public discussion of violence. Only 9% agreed with the statement that “Violence against women is not the sort of issue that should be publicly discussed”, whereas 82% disagreed with this.
  (b) Only 7% disagreed with the statement that “The public as a whole do not know enough about violence and abuse”. The fact that 72% agreed with this statement suggests that the public feel a need for a campaign such as the Zero Tolerance Campaign to counteract perceived public ignorance.

• Women were consistently more supportive of the campaign than men; gender was related to the distribution of responses on nearly all of the knowledge, attitudinal and evaluative statements. Women were also more likely to have discussed the campaign with other people. Despite this consistent difference by sex, most men also expressed support for the Zero Tolerance Campaign: only 12% of men were negative about the campaign overall.

• Younger people (particularly those aged 15-29 years) consistently expressed stronger support for the campaign. However, even among the oldest group (50+ years), only 12% described themselves as ‘quite’ or ‘very negative’; only 7% of this group disagreed with the statement that “Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse”, and less than one fifth agreed with the statement that “The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image”. The oldest group were more often unsure in their responses to the knowledge, attitudes and evaluative statements in the survey.

• Few statistically significant differences were seen between owner-occupiers and others (the proxy measure used here to represent social class).

Hence the data from the street survey provided evidence of strong and wide public support for the Zero Tolerance Campaign, and little evidence for dissension from the messages of, or the need for, the campaign even amongst the less supportive groups.
III. 2. Summary of Main Findings from the Focus Groups

III. 2.1. Overall campaign design - layout, display and publicity strategy
The focus group data suggest that the success of the campaign in attracting public attention was facilitated by:
- The strong ‘Z’ logo
- The controversial/thought provoking nature of some of the statements
- Locating some of the advertisements in a popular and central site in the city
- The use of staggered billboards sited (along the full length of Princes Street)
- Bringing out a series of different advertisements over time
- Collaboration with the mass media to back up the campaign.

The only clear problems with the design of the material were:
- The text on the picture-posters displayed on billboards appears to be too small for people to read easily as they drive past.
- The lower strap-line on the picture-posters is too far away from the strap-line immediately beneath the picture and may be ‘lost’ as it is along the same line of vision as the routine statements that appear on every poster.

III. 2.2. Main reasons for liking or disliking the campaign

Main reasons given for liking the campaign included:
- It is good for Edinburgh’s image and shows that the council is forward-thinking, innovative and cares about the female citizens of the city.
- It is thought-provoking and informative.
- It addresses an important topic that we all need to know more about.
- It is high-profile and highly visible.
- It addresses the root causes of abuse (i.e. male socialisation and the abuse of power) and asks men to consider the issue instead of simply asking women to protect themselves.
- It challenges everyone, rather than just targeting those known to be victims or perpetrators of violence. It relieves survivors of the burden of revealing the secret of widespread abuse and helps those who are abused to realise that they are not alone.
- The campaign is empowering. It encourages resistance to abuse and mobilises individuals and groups to organise against such violence.

Main reasons given for disliking the campaign included:
- It is bad for Edinburgh’s image. It stigmatises Edinburgh and gives the wrong impression to tourists.
- It might be distressing for women who have been abused.
- It is scare-mongering.
- It may encourage women to mistrust male friends and relatives.
- It is ‘anti-men’, labelling all men as potential rapists.
- It excludes male victims and ignores female perpetrators.
- It fails to address the root causes of abuse (e.g. the breakdown of the family, male role confusion or individual men’s unhappiness, frustration or mental illness). It is therefore identifying a problem without offering any solutions and the money would have been better spent on service-provision.
III. 2.3. A summary of common concerns

- Distress: Confronting people with billboards talking about sexual violence might be distressing for some people who prefer not to think about the problem or who have had no choice but to try and forget about their own experiences. However, most group participants felt that 'getting it out into the open' could only help in the long run. In addition, far from feeling traumatised by the campaign, some group participants who had been abused said that the posters actually made them feel less isolated and burdened. The possibilities of causing unnecessary distress could be minimised by the provision of back-up information, help-lines and support services.

- Fear: Some group participants suggested that the campaign might make people (other than themselves) unnecessarily frightened. However, no one seemed to think that the campaign had, in fact, unreasonably increased their own fear. There was little evidence to suggest women would prefer to be protected from the facts about violence and sexual abuse. Nor was there any support for the suggestion that the campaign might make women more fearful of going out at night. In fact the campaign made some women less alarmed about street violence precisely because it located the source of danger as women’s own homes. The campaign seemed to reassure some women that they were less likely to be attacked by a stranger than they might have thought, yet there did not appear to be any corresponding increase in women’s fears of experiencing violence at home.

- Distrust: Some group participants were concerned that the campaign implied that women should not trust any man. They were worried by the statistics pointing out that most violence and abuse came from men that women know. They felt this suggested that women should be wary of their friends and relatives. However, evidence from the focus groups suggests that the fact that the campaign identifies ‘known’ men as the perpetrators of abuse might help some women to identify existing behaviour from partners or husbands as unacceptable but it does not make women wary of men whom they have previously trusted.

III. 2.4. How women and men ‘position’ themselves in relation to the adverts

Most group participants felt that women were positioned by the adverts as ‘people with rights’, some women found the campaign very empowering. The phrase ‘No Man has the Right’ attracted particularly positive responses. The position for men was more ambiguous. Some felt excluded from the campaign or located only as ‘potential rapists’, others felt that the campaign had a direct message for them and was a useful source of information and insight.

III. 2.5. Addressing sexual violence and abuse as a ‘gendered issue’

There was a great deal of debate about the advantages and disadvantages of identifying rape and abuse within the home as a ‘gendered issue’. Group participants were divided over whether or not the campaign was ‘anti-men’. Some were concerned that identifying sexual abuse and violence within the home as a crime perpetrated largely by men was sexist and divisive. Others, however, felt that the campaign was ‘anti male abuse of power’ rather than being ‘anti-men’. They felt that identifying a continuum of abusive male behaviour was an essential part of the campaign.
III. 2.6. Accepting or rejecting the statistics.

- Group participants often explained away the statistics (about the proportion of women murdered by their partners or raped by men that they knew) in ways which distanced the figures from their own lives. People frequently made comments which suggested that they thought that the figures were not as ‘bad’ as they might seem on the face of things.

- A major reason for accepting or rejecting the statistics lay in people’s personal experience or contacts (i.e. what they knew about their friends’ personal experiences). Those who had friends they knew to have been raped, battered or abused were more likely to accept the figures than those who believed that they did not know anyone who had been physically or sexually assaulted.

III. 2.7. Reaction to the photographs used on the picture-posters

- The Zero Tolerance photographs remind people of familiar images conventionally used in commercial advertisements for furniture, insurance or fireplaces. The setting for the photographs were widely recognised as representing the archetypal symbol of the white middle-class ‘ideal home’. Respondents were ‘literate’ in such symbolism, and often had strong emotive associations with such images (associations of happiness, warmth and security). This was sometimes true even if their own homes did not in any way resemble the home portrayed in the picture. However, some black research participants felt the ‘whiteness’ of the imagery made them feel distanced from the pictures and helped to reinforce the silence about violence against women within black communities.

- Most group participants saw the middle-class setting in the photographs as an important challenge to the idea that abuse only happens in working class homes. The use of such images was seen to carry a clear message that: ‘it could happen to anyone’. Some working-class respondents expressed the view that the authorities and the media accepted violence as part of ‘working-class culture’ and that no one would be shocked that such things went on in their communities. There also seemed to be some sense that presenting it as a problem that affected middle-class people meant that it ‘really mattered’ or would be taken seriously.

- Group participants experienced shock and unease at the sharp contrast between the statements about violence and the photographs of ‘traditional happy homes’. This disjuncture was highly effective in disrupting assumptions and encouraging people to think and talk about the advertisements.

- The fact that the women and girls in the photographs displayed no obvious symptoms of abuse brings home the idea that both the perpetrators and the victims of violence may try to hide what is going on and that there may be a large hidden problem throughout society. This message was particularly important in the light of the fact that some people dismissed the statistics about the prevalence of violence against women on the grounds that they, personally, did not know anyone who had been abused.
• However some women wanted to see images which reflected the brutality of abuse. In particular they wanted advertisements aimed at violent men which would confront them with the damage they do. This concern crystallised around the picture on one particular advert (‘She lives with a successful business man...’) which several group participants saw as unrealistic and actually sanitising violence. Other women, however, felt that images of women as ‘visible victims’ were disempowering and unnecessary.

III. 2.8. Public perceptions of the way forward

• Many people would like to see more of the campaign and would like access to more information. They would like to see the concept adapted to address a wider range of issues and the campaign has also stimulated a demand to address particular concerns such as racist assaults and the sexual abuse of boys.

• In addition research participants often expressed concern about the financing of provisions such as refuges (‘Advertisements are not enough’) and the campaign served as a focus for discontents about legal and policy issues (e.g. public transport policy) which impact upon women’s safety.

• Finally, there was a widespread feeling that campaigns against violence needed to be taken into schools and that it was vital to work with young people.

III. 3. The success of the Campaign and the implications for Edinburgh

The Zero Tolerance campaign has been extremely successful in attracting attention and gaining a positive reaction from the majority of people who took part in the street survey. The focus group data also suggest that it has achieved its stated aims in so far as the campaign has generated debate and focused people’s discontent about the provisions for, and protection of, women subjected to violence. In particular the campaign has highlighted the prevalence of the various crimes of violence against women and children and is understood to send out a clear message that these forms of violence should not be tolerated. People also recognise that the campaign is seeking to debunk some of the myths around violence against women (such as the myth that it is ‘only a working class problem’ or that most sexual assaults are perpetrated by strangers). Although we do not have any ‘before’ and ‘after’ data to provide a quantitative measure of changing levels of awareness we do have evidence from the focus groups that the campaign is providing people with new information, perspectives and concepts and has been thought-provoking.

Strong feelings were expressed both for and against the campaign. At the same time the statistics from the street survey suggest that it has only alienated a small minority of the population. There is widespread public approval for the adoption of such campaigns and the combined evidence of the street survey and the group discussion data suggest that Edinburgh District council has actually improved its own image, and the image of the city, in the eyes of many people.
III. 4. Implications for other areas adopting the Zero Tolerance Campaign or adapting/developing their own materials

- There is a widespread feeling that campaigns of this nature are desperately needed and there is general support for the Zero Tolerance Campaign (and the possibility of other public awareness interventions of this type). It is likely to be welcomed by the majority of the population in other regions/areas.

- Many women feel empowered by the advertising and some men feel challenged in a positive way. However, a small minority of the population (both men and women) are deeply offended by the material. The phrase ‘Male abuse of power is a crime’ seems to be both one of the most challenging, and one of the most controversial, statements.

- The publicity strategy adopted by the campaign organisers in Edinburgh has been strikingly successful and offers a model for future campaign promotions. In particular, its effectiveness depends on siting some material in a central and prestigious location and encouraging the local media to cover the campaign. In addition, consulting with, and involving, local organisations who are doing direct work around violence against women has been an important ingredient in its success.

- As more areas take on the Zero Tolerance campaign it is likely that concern about stigmatising any particular region will decrease. However, other sources of hostility to the campaign (such as the complaint that it is anti-men) are likely to remain.

- Certain aspects of the Zero Tolerance campaign (from the highly recognisable ‘Z’ to the combination of ‘cosy’, middle-class images and forthright wording) have been highly successful and might usefully be borrowed for adaptation elsewhere.

- However, certain problems have also been highlighted such as the ‘whiteness’ of the images and the absence of information helping people to understand why women might stay in abusive situations.

- The research discussed here is Edinburgh-centred. Other regions adopting the campaign should consult with local organisations (e.g. those doing direct work with victims/survivors) and take into account the composition and history of their own areas (particularly over issues such as racism). It may also be useful to conduct surveys both before and after the campaign has been launched locally in order to document any changes in public awareness.

- Ideally, if further material is to be developed, then funds should be made available for proper pre-testing with the target groups. Only consulting with organisations with a high knowledge base, and not pre-testing advertisements with ‘lay groups’, may lead to creating some messages which are misunderstood or misinterpreted by members of the public. Given the challenging nature of any campaign designed to change public awareness this pre-testing should focus on people’s comprehension rather than simply looking at ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ ratings of the material.
• Back-up leaflets could be incorporated as a major part of the campaign. These could include personal testimonies, explanations of some of the ideas in the campaign and information about legal rights (e.g. re. police powers and housing rights).

• Help-line numbers and the contact addresses of support agencies might also usefully be included. However, the inclusion of such information must be the subject of discussion with the relevant organisations and the implications for their funding needs to be considered given that their work-load is likely to expand.

• In addition to high-profile material targeted at the general public there would be support for taking material about violence into schools and doing some direct work with young people on this subject.
IV. SAMPLE AND METHODS

IV. 1. The street survey: method

The street survey was designed to explore the opinions of a representative sample of people in Edinburgh. The questions were phrased in order to explore concerns that had already been raised in feedback to the EDC (e.g. in letters to the council, press coverage and comments made in public meetings). All the street survey interviews took place in Princes Street, Edinburgh and were conducted by 8 interviewers (4 men and 4 women). The survey was undertaken in late May 1993, immediately before the placards were dismantled. Each interviewer was given a set of instructions to enable them to achieve an appropriate balance of interviewees with respect to age, gender and tenure. Questionnaires were returned for 228 respondents, although one had a substantial amount of missing data and is therefore excluded from most subsequent analyses. The chi-square test is used to demonstrate the presence or absence of statistically significant patterns between subgroups of interest. Where sub-groups have been combined to get a valid chi-square statistic this is indicated in a footnote to the relevant table.

IV. 2. The street survey: sample characteristics

Fifty six percent of respondents were women; respondents were split relatively evenly between the age groups (15-29; 30-49; 50+). Fifty-eight percent were living in owner-occupied accommodation; and 50% were currently employed (see Table 1). Interviews were achieved with a slightly higher proportion of younger respondents (under 30 years) and slightly lower proportion of older respondents than planned, but otherwise the interviewees appear to reflect the age, sex and class composition of Edinburgh (although we have no information about how many people in each category had refused to take part in the Survey before the assigned quotas were achieved). See Appendix for detailed data on the knowledge and attitudes of the sample and further demographic details.

IV. 3. The focus groups: method

Focus groups are guided group discussions which make use of the interaction between members of the group in order to explore their views and attitudes. Focus group methodology is a way of addressing the fact that people do not react to an advertisement, film or newspaper article in a social or cultural vacuum, but frame and develop their understandings in interaction with others (Morley, 1980; Kitzinger, 1994). The focus groups were used in order to:

(a) provide more in-depth qualitative information about people’s feelings about the campaign and to produce detailed feedback about their responses to each individual advertisement;
(b) identify areas of criticism or praise for the campaign which were not addressed in the survey;
(c) explore the reasons why people responded to the campaign as they did;
(d) ‘post-test’ the questionnaire data and clarify what people might have meant by their replies to the survey questions;
(e) examine how the information provided by the campaign material was processed by different audiences and used in social interaction.

---

3 We would particularly like to thank the street survey interviewers: Rob Shuter, Marie Rose, Michael Rosie, Amanda Kani, Steven Kenneth, Clare Troddan, Peter Campbell, Linda Watson-Brown.
Eleven groups were conducted in Edinburgh, each one consisting of about 6 people. All sessions were tape-recorded. In addition to open discussion the groups were presented with the Zero Tolerance material and asked to discuss each advertisement in turn. The material was usually presented in a step-by-step way: first showing people the pictures and asking them to recall the captions before revealing the whole advertisement. We also had the opportunity to show one of the Zero Tolerance Advertisements (‘By the time they reach eighteen...’) to an additional 6 groups in and around Glasgow. The total number of people who were able to comment on the campaign via the focus groups was, therefore, around one hundred.

IV. 4. The focus groups: sample characteristics

Because we had already completed the street survey on a representative sample the focus groups were selected in order to try to explore a range of opinions, rather than to be representative. In particular, an effort was made to include people who might be particularly critical of the campaign and/or have suggestions for improvements. The final eleven groups from Edinburgh consisted of six ‘lay’ groups covering a range of age/gender/class variables (e.g. an age range of 12-62 years old) and five ‘special interest’ groups. The ‘special interest’ groups all had some type of specialist knowledge around crime, abuse, domestic violence or ‘family conflict’, albeit from some very different perspectives. [See below for details]

Focus Groups conducted in Edinburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Group</th>
<th>No. of male and female participants</th>
<th>Code identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office workers (from a range of white-collar occupations)</td>
<td>3m, 2f</td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of women residents (from the same working class area of Edinburgh)</td>
<td>13f</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in Marriage Counselling service</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth group (from another working class area of Edinburgh)</td>
<td>9f</td>
<td>Grp 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Railway workers</td>
<td>3m,2f</td>
<td>Grp 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the Christian Women’s Guild</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Grp 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Aid workers</td>
<td>5f</td>
<td>Grp 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>3m</td>
<td>Grp 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents involved in Gingerbread</td>
<td>6f</td>
<td>Grp 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest survivors self-help group</td>
<td>5f</td>
<td>Grp 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZERU A BABA (Shakti women’s group)</td>
<td>4f</td>
<td>Grp 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus groups conducted in and around Glasgow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Group</th>
<th>No. of male and female participants</th>
<th>Code identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours in middle-class suburb of Glasgow</td>
<td>5f</td>
<td>Grp 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbours in working-class area of Glasgow</td>
<td>4f, 1m</td>
<td>Grp 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's Education Association women's group, Greenock - no. 1</td>
<td>13f</td>
<td>Grp 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker's Education Association, women's group, Greenock - no. 2</td>
<td>5f</td>
<td>Grp 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4f,1m</td>
<td>Grp 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics (social scientists)</td>
<td>6f</td>
<td>Grp 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All quotations are identified by a group identifier and by the letter ‘m’ or ‘f’ to identify the gender of the speaker as male or female respectively. None of the groups were speaking as representatives of the organisations to which they belong. Thus the group of police officers do not ‘represent’ the views of the Lothian Police Force nor are the members of Gingerbread or the Christian Women’s Guild speaking for their entire organisation. It should also be noted that there was considerable diversity of opinion within groups. Although quotes are not attributed to individual members of the groups, this diversity should be borne in mind.
V. DID PEOPLE KNOW ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN?

V.1. Exposure, siting and design of the campaign

Sixty-four percent of the street survey respondents had seen or heard something about the campaign. From the group discussions, it seemed that the posters on Princes Street appeared to be particularly noticeable to bus passengers (rather than drivers or pedestrians), and from the street survey it was clear that people were far more likely to know about the campaign if they were regular visitors to the Street rather than occasional passers-by. The chance that people were aware of the campaign rose to 85% when examining the figures on those who visited Princes Street three or more times per week (see Appendix, Table 3a). This figure compares favourably to other site-specific exposure rates (see Kitzinger, 1993). [For a detailed look at how gender, class and age influence ‘exposure’ to the campaign see Appendix]

Within the group discussion it was clear that the ‘Z’ and the phrase ‘Zero Tolerance’ had a high recognition value. The Z gave the campaign an identity and linked the diverse posters together:

‘I love the Z. I think it’s eye-catching and terrific.’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

‘It has a very strong sense of style.’ [Grp 1, office workers, m]

‘As soon as I see ‘Zero Tolerance’ it reminded me of the mark of Zorro’ [...] I think a whole generation that were brought up with the mark of Zorro - the posters will have imprinted.’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

It was, indeed, the ‘Z’ that was most likely to be remembered. For example, before showing one group the caption to one of the advertisements they were asked what they thought it would say. They replied:

fl: It’ll be a big Z anyway
f2: ‘aye’
f3: ‘aye’
JK: ‘You all remember the big Z?’
f2: ‘Aye’
f3: ‘They’ve all got big Zs’
fl: ‘Zorro’s been around again!’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members]

The meaning of the ‘Z’ was often not immediately apparent, but some respondents felt that this increased the effectiveness of the advertisements: ‘It’s good because it sort of plays on that advertising thing, like people saying “What’s that?” and then they take more interest and they look.’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

Although some respondents thought the obscurity of the phrase ‘Zero Tolerance’ had been a problem, others felt that this had worked well, precisely because it made them engage with the posters and forced them to think:

m1: It was more of a rather obscure statement that you had to try to work out for yourself what it was all about. It didn’t have an initial impact on me as such, you know.

m2: but was that not the idea of the original poster? [...] It’s basically a case of trying to figure it out for yourself. [Grp 5, Transport workers]
Producing a series of different advertisements that were displayed at different points in time also appeared to maintain public interest once people’s attention had been attracted to the campaign:

All these posters were put up and you thought ‘what's all that about?’ and then a fortnight later something else was put up and you thought ‘Christ, that's what it's about!’ [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

I just keep thinking that there's going to be another part coming up soon, like the coffee adverts, a wee mini-series, what's next? I watched them. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]

The siting of a series of posters along the full length of Princes Street also increased the chances of people noticing and reading each individual statement - at least during a series of visits to the street:

Having the series of one after another [meant that] you were watching to see what the next one was. [...] If you missed one, you would look again [next time] to see if that was the one you missed. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

This strategy encourages people to take in a whole series of statements which could not possibly go on a single advertisement. However, this strategy works best in a central site to which people return for repeated visits:

You'd be going along on the bus and you'd be glancing out and see ‘Zero Tolerance’ and the bus would then move on and you'd think ‘Zero what?’ What's all that about? So the next day you'd be coming along the same way and then you'd be able to read the next bit and you'd see some interesting statistics. But it was only going along Princes Street the same time, everyday on the same bus that you were able to get together what this Zero Tolerance was all about. [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

V. 2. Talking about the campaign

Perhaps even more striking than the high reported exposure rate was the fact that 39% of those who had noticed the campaign had actually discussed it with someone. In the focus groups people reported conversations with family, friends and colleagues and overhearing remarks on buses. The very fact that the campaign was unusual and somewhat controversial contributed to the likelihood of it being discussed: ‘they were controversial and they got people talking about it.’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

V. 3. Media coverage

The most common source of knowledge about the campaign was seeing the actual posters (92%); but over half of those who had noticed the campaign (52%) had seen press coverage. The ‘Z’ had been important here too, in attracting people’s attention:

‘If you are flipping through a magazine and see the Z sign it is already something you would identify with, and so you would look at it again’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f].

It was also clear that some people only began to understand the nature of the campaign after reading about it in the mass media.

‘I hadn’t a clue what it was. I just saw the Zs [...] it is only more recently that I have seen things in magazines [...] and it has become clearer what it is about’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f].
Seeing the posters led people to read the articles and vice versa. The attendant media coverage was an essential part of the campaign inciting interest and providing both reinforcement and explanation for the campaign.

V. 4. What about the minority who did not notice the campaign?

In spite of the success of the campaign in attracting the attention of most respondents, there were some people who had never noticed the campaign. This seemed to be partly a function of where they lived and how often they visited the city centre. Obviously those outside Edinburgh had less chance of being exposed to the material in the first place (see Table 3b). However, 15% of regular users of Princes Street had not noticed the Zero Tolerance material. The focus group data suggest that this is partly a function of whether they were able to look around as they went about their daily business: ‘I’m too busy watching the kids to look up’ [Grp 2, residents, f]. Although there was no significant difference in reported exposure to the campaign by gender or housing tenure there was a clear association with age. Only 49% of people aged 50 or over had seen or heard about the campaign, as opposed to 71% of those in the 15-29 and the 30-49 age groups. Similarly older people were much less likely to have talked about the campaign with anyone, even if they had noticed it (see Table 3b). Not noticing the campaign could also be partly a function of whether or not people had any sympathy with the campaign material in the first place.

I didn’t notice [it]. I probably looked and didn’t see anything, but it might have been when I knew I was coming here [to the discussion], [I thought] ‘that was the thing that was advertised so badly on Princes Street’ and switched off, as much as to say ‘that’s as much as we want of it’. End of story. [Grp 6, Christian Women’s Guild, f]

Several research participants also criticised the campaign logo and ‘catch-phrase’ for being obscure, although in practice it had often incited their own curiosity:

f1: The first time I looked at it - ‘Zero Tolerance’, what are they talking about? - Then the penny dropped.’
JK: How did the penny drop?
f1: After thinking how stupid it was another thing came into mind, something I must have read in the paper, why should women tolerate this, but unless you had an inkling it meant nothing, and to most people it still means nothing. [Grp 6, Christian Women’s Guild, f]
VI. DID PEOPLE FEEL POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN?

Overall support for the Zero Tolerance campaign was very high. 79% of those who were already aware of the campaign said that they felt ‘very positive’ or ‘quite positive’ about it. Support was higher among women, rather than men (87% versus 67% feeling positive). People were also more likely to feel positive about the campaign if they were owner-occupiers rather than living in rented accommodation (86% versus 68%). This is largely accounted for by the fact that those living in rented accommodation were much more likely to say they felt neither positive nor negative about the campaign (23% v 9%). (See Table 4a).

Further support for the campaign is evident in the responses to two other statements. Only 11% of the sample agreed that the display of the Zero Tolerance posters on Princes Street was: ‘...bad for Edinburgh’s image’ and only 4% disagree with the statement that ‘Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse’. Most people approved of Edinburgh taking action in this area and did not feel that the campaign damaged the image of the city. (See tables no 4b & 4c)

From the group discussions it was evident that those who felt that the campaign damaged Edinburgh’s image felt that the posters were ‘ugly’ and that they stigmatised Edinburgh (suggesting that violence was a particular problem for this city):

> It wasn’t suitable for Princes Street. That’s not what these big stands, to my mind are for. They are there to beautify the city throughout the year and these offended me immensely. I can’t tell you what was on them [...] I would be stopped at the traffic lights and see these awful things and it would just switch me off completely. [Grp 6, Christian Women’s Guild, f]

> Princes Street is for tourists. They [the posters] shouldn’t be there at all, I don’t think. [Grp 1, Office workers, f]

However, most research participants seemed to welcome the high-profile display of the material. They felt it was important to reach as many people as possible and welcomed the prestige location of the campaign as evidence that the district council was really taking the problem seriously. Members of a youth group from a working-class area of Edinburgh, for example, thought that Princes Street was an ideal place for the campaign material because: ‘lots of people go there, like tourists and everything.’ and they liked the posters ‘it livens it up, like seeing loads of posters, it would be dull without any adverts round Princes Street’. They recommended that the Zero Tolerance statements be translated into many different languages so more people could understand them and they wanted leaflets available as well: ‘so everybody knows about violence and all that’. One member of this group even suggested that the posters would be better in luminous pink! [Grp 4, Youth Group, f]

Some research participants expressed great pride in their city for initiating the campaign and thought that the council ‘deserves a round of applause’ for taking on this difficult and
painful issue. A member of the incest survivors self-help group, for example, described her reaction to the campaign:

You know that sort of prickly feeling, like when you see something and think....oooooh! It was when all the posters were up along the tripods right along Princes Street [...] I couldn’t believe it. I was going along in the bus and I thought: ‘There’s one there. There’s another one! They haven’t got them all along Princes Street...YES! They have! It was very good. [I felt] Yes, this is what I want. I want people to see this.[...] Next month it will be on the buses. They’ll go by and you’ll go: “Yes, I’ll get on that one. Look at that!” [laughter] [Grp 10. Self-help group, f]

Many respondents felt that, far from being bad for Edinburgh’s image, the campaign had, in fact, improved it:

I’m pretty glad it was Edinburgh that did it, [...] because we are seen as this capital city and quite well respected all over the world and quite cultured, if you like. I think it’s a word that’s bandied all over the world and I think for that to have started in Edinburgh..., I’m really proud of the fact. That is brilliant. [...] [People should be] proud that the city’s taking on something like this and put it in the most noticeable place in Edinburgh, apart from flying a banner from the top of the castle! [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

Far from stigmatising Edinburgh some respondents felt that the Zero Tolerance Campaign showed that Edinburgh was ‘keeping up with the times’:

It’s not just happening here in Edinburgh, it’s a global issue [...] Even in the Third World they are doing something about domestic and other forms of violence. They do positive things, say, if someone’s being attacked by a husband or whoever, the women themselves do something to stop the violence [...] So this is happening in the Third World, so why can’t we do that here in Europe? [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

For one woman, who had recently moved to Edinburgh, the campaign had reassured her that she was not moving to a ‘backward’ city:

‘It was me moving back twenty years as far as I was concerned, coming up here. So it was surprising to me that they could be so advanced to do something like this.’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

Some long-term residents of the city were particularly pleased that Edinburgh, rather than Glasgow, had been the first city to take this issue on board in such a high profile way:

I think Edinburgh is also seen as a kind of cold city compared to Glasgow. Speaking as an Edinburgh person myself, Glasgow’s always seen as having a kind of warmth, whereas Edinburgh’s always that slightly bit stand-offish and I think for Edinburgh to do that is marvellous. I would have expected that from Glasgow rather than Edinburgh. So I think it’s great that we’ve done it. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]
VII. WHAT DID PEOPLE GENERALLY LIKE ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN?

The street survey provided statistical information about who felt positive and who felt negative about the campaign and tells us a little about their characteristics. (See Appendix). The focus groups provided a forum within which to explore how and why people felt as they did.

The majority (79%) of the street survey respondents felt ‘very positive’ or ‘quite positive’ about the campaign. In the focus groups the main reasons for feeling positive about the campaign were:

1. It is good for Edinburgh’s image and shows that the council is forward-thinking, innovative and cares about the female citizens of the city. (See section VI, above)
2. It is thought-provoking and informative
3. It addresses an important topic that we all need to know more about.
4. It is high-profile and highly visible.
5. It addresses the root causes of abuse (i.e. male socialisation and the abuse of power) and asks men to consider the issue instead of asking women to change.
6. It challenges everyone, rather than just targeting those known to be victims or perpetrators of violence. It relieves survivors of the burden of revealing the secret of widespread abuse and helps those who are abused to realise that they are not alone.
7. The campaign is empowering. It encourages resistance to abuse and mobilises individuals and groups to organise against such violence.

Many of the group participants felt that the Zero Tolerance campaign was evidence that Edinburgh District council cared about women and the street survey revealed wide support for public awareness campaigns about sexual violence and abuse. Eighty-two percent of the survey respondents disagreed with the statement: ‘Violence against women in not the sort of issue that should be publicly discussed’ and 72% agreed that ‘the public as a whole do not know enough about violence and abuse’. (See tables 7a & 7b). In the focus groups it was clear that some participants felt they personally had learnt a lot from the campaign and that they welcomed public discussion of this issue. They were pleased that the campaign posters were located in a high-prestige site in the city centre as this appeared to illustrate the priority given to the campaign, served to dramatically bring the problem ‘out of the closet’ and made the information accessible to a wide range of people. They felt that the advertisements challenged stereotypes and appreciated the fact that they were aimed at men as well as women: *Is the only campaign that says you know its men who need to change [...] I think its the first one in Britain that’s ever taken that stance.* [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]. The campaign was also seen as empowering: encouraging resistance to abuse and mobilising individuals and groups to organise against such violence: ‘It lets you know you don’t have to put up with it.’ [Grp 2, residents, f]

In addition, there was support for the idea of addressing the ‘general public’ instead of singling out those known be victims or perpetrators. Members of the incest survivors self-help group, in particular, praised the campaign for helping those who are abused to realise they are not alone and for relieving survivors of the burden of revealing the secret of widespread abuse. These women described how they are often met with rejection and evasion when they talk about their own experiences. They face people’s discomfort and anger when they breach the silence surrounding the subject of sexual violence. They were not surprised that the campaign attracted some strong negative reactions, but applauded
the District Council for taking on some of the burden of that anger and saying that child sexual abuse does happen:

‘You’d just need to know it was there, and you weren’t the only one bringing it up, which is what campaigns like that do. It let’s you know it’s THERE. It is not because somebody is standing there saying “I was raped as a child” that it’s there. [...] If it’s just a big picture on a billboard, then nobody’s personally responsible for bringing that up. That’s kind of the burden that we leave survivors with... It’s sort of like, nobody speaks about child abuse, except survivors, and that allows them to.... they’re pressing everybody’s button that hasn’t been pressed before. It unleashes whatever they want to bring up. [...] [The council] definitely deserve a round of applause for that, because they’re relieving the burden of bringing it up into every-day life from the people who are affected by it. [Grp 10. Self-help group, f]
VIII. WHAT DID PEOPLE GENERALLY DISLIKE ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN?

A minority (6%) of respondents to the street sample felt ‘quite negative’ (5%) or ‘very negative’ (1%) about the campaign. In the focus group the main reasons for feeling negative about the campaign were:

1. It is bad for Edinburgh’s image. It stigmatises Edinburgh and gives the wrong impression to tourists. (See section VII, above)
2. It might be distressing for women who have been abused.
3. It is scare-mongering.
4. It may encourage women to mistrust men that they know.
5. It is ‘anti-men’, labelling all men as potential rapists.
6. It excludes male victims and ignores female perpetrators.
7. The Zero Tolerance Campaign fails to address the root causes of abuse (e.g. the breakdown of the family, male role confusion or individual men’s unhappiness, frustration or mental illness). It is therefore identifying a problem without offering any solutions and the money would have been better spent on service-provision.

The following discussion addresses three of the above themes (distress, fear and mistrust) in more detail before going on to explore the other complaints through, for example, examining how men and women ‘positioned’ themselves in relation to the advertisements and exploring the debate about presenting sexual violence and abuse as a ‘gendered issue’ (i.e. addressing the argument that the campaign is ‘anti-men’).
IX. A DETAILED LOOK AT SOME COMMON CONCERNS

IX. 1. Distressing to victims/survivors?

One concern was that the Zero Tolerance posters could confront people with their own experiences of violence in a very traumatic way - ‘rubbing their nose in it’. Certainly one complaint to the District Council came from a woman in her sixties who said she preferred to forget what had happened to her and did not want to be reminded. However, this was not seen as a problem by most of the participants in the group discussions. (Although, the research participants obviously knew the researcher was coming to discuss the Zero Tolerance Campaign so the groups were unlikely to include anyone who wanted totally to avoid the issue). Instead many research participants who had been assaulted said they welcomed the posters. The Zero Tolerance materials made them feel that they were not alone and helped them to deal with what had happened or was happening to them. Being confronted with the unpleasant facts was seen as necessary and far preferable to ignoring the problem. ‘It’s the silence that’s rubbing our nose in it, that kind of common notion of “keep it quiet”. That’s shoving your nose down all the time.’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f].

One member of the incest survivors group initially expressed concern that the posters might trigger memories for vulnerable teenagers. Looking back on how she had felt as a teenager she expressed concern for the teenagers of today:

I think maybe it [the Zero Tolerance campaign] might have triggered [memories] [...] But I see that as very traumatic, because if things are triggered into a situation where there is not anywhere to go and get help [...] [that] spells danger to me in some ways. Because I think I really started remembering when I was well and truly safe and away from the situation and able to cope with it and at least find support for myself. Whereas, as a teenager being put in that position, perhaps it’s a bit worrying. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f].

Another member of the group, however, felt that the campaign was one way of ensuring that women did not have to deny and hide from memories of their own abuse.

We were teenagers at a time - almost an era - before the teenagers of today and the teenagers of today and the children of today and tomorrow. I think maybe it’s the other way round of saying what you have just said. It is because of the absence of posters like that when we were little that we had to keep it down - we had to deny it - bury it deeper and deeper. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

IX. 2. Increasing women’s sense of fear?

Several research participants expressed concern that the Zero Tolerance campaign might heighten women’s fears. As one policeman stated:

When we go out to give personal safety talks to women [...] we’ve got to reassure them and we say ‘we’ve got to get everything into perspective, we live in a relatively safe city’ [...] I’m not disputing the figures here but what concerns me is that people might read them and [...] actually build up fears that they didn’t have before. [...] I’m frightened that the statistics that are quoted could be scare-mongering, albeit that they are accurate. [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]
He was concerned that women might react by thinking: ‘Oh no, I didn’t realise it was so bad, I don’t want to go out this evening, I won’t go out after dark’.

Although women did describe the statistics as ‘shocking’ or ‘frightening’, no one volunteered that the campaign had increased their anxiety about going out at night. It would seem that the fear of walking down a dark street is very much part of women’s lives anyway (informed by personal experience of harassment on the streets, press reports, TV, fiction and films): ‘It’s always at the back of my mind, well - at the forefront of my mind. There’s always that threat if it’s a dark night and you’re walking by yourself.’ [Grp 1, Office workers, f] At most they described how the posters could ‘put them in touch’ with those feelings but this was presented as a reason for being ‘pro’ rather than ‘anti’ the campaign. Several women resented any suggestion that they should be protected from the facts:

We don’t want to be reassured that we’re safe, we want to know whether in fact we are in danger. That’s the way to defend yourself is it not? [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

If they are trying to keep the statistics from the women they are denying them the knowledge. It is their right to know about these things. [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

Many of the research participants also emphasised that the campaign did not feed into their fear of street violence because all the advertisements showed domestic scenes within the home and some of the statements made it clear that an attacker was more likely to be a friend than some stranger leaping out from a dark alley. Thus, while the police officer quoted above suggested that the campaign might make people ‘so scared that they can’t go out’ there was evidence that, in some ways, the campaign could actually make women feel less afraid:

‘It’s made me feel better because […] It made me realise that most violence comes from one’s partner or in your own home. So it made me feel a wee bit more confident, not quite so alarmist about the sort of late night, dark street, scenario. [Grp 1, Office workers, f]

The campaign did, however, increase some research participants’ fears for their children, although, again, this was not necessarily seen as a negative effect:

m1: I’ve got two young children, I don’t want to think about anybody abusing my kids…
JK: so what does this advert do for you as a parent?
m1: It’s difficult, right. It’s really, really difficult. The worst nightmare I have is in that picture. That is what I do not want to happen to my kids. […] It’s good, of course it is good, it’s making you think. But I’ve left my children in the house and the last thing I want to think about tonight is that they might be abused. It’s a very good advert.
JK: Why is it good?
m1: Because it terrifies me!
JK: Why is it good to terrify you?
m2: If it’s making me aware that someone could abuse my children, then that is a bloody good advert. [Grp 5, Transport workers]

Even if the advertisements were alarming, this was not necessarily seen as a reason to take them down. A false sense of security was seen, by some, as worse than an ‘over-developed’ sense of danger. A couple of research participants also pointed out that:

‘[If] you think nothing can happen to you then when it does happen to you it scares you even more’. and ‘It’s a bad state to be in: to feel threatened and vulnerable as
you are going about your everyday life. But what sort of state is it to feel safe and to be surprised? [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f; Grp 10, Self-help group, f].

Such concerns are backed up by research showing that if women were attacked in places that they felt secure, their reactions were likely to be more severe. (Scheppkele & Bart, 1983)

IX. 3. Making women distrust men that they know?

Most research participants identified a clear message in the campaign that women were more likely to be assaulted by men that they knew, rather than by complete strangers. The Zero Tolerance material includes explicit references to violence from ‘husbands’ and ‘fathers’ and display statistics stating such facts as ‘85% of rapes are committed by men known to the victim’ and ‘Half of all women murdered are killed by their partner or ex-partner’. Reaction to the public display of such statements varied from the marriage guidance counsellor who asked ‘What is the purpose? Is it to make us all frightened of our partners?’ to the police officer who commented: ‘I don’t see any harm in it. It’s a fact, why should we conceal a fact?’ right through to the incest survivor who declared, ‘Have other people known this before today? [...] How come that piece of information exists and there has not been anything done about it? [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

Many participants welcomed access to this information: ‘It explodes the myth, that rapists are guys who jump out of a dark alleyway’ [Grp 1, Office workers, m]. They approved of reference to abuse from fathers and husbands because ‘The stranger gets publicised, if it’s the husband or the father it gets swept under the carpet.’ [Grp 2, residents, f] It was seen as vital to name such close relatives because of the lack of attention given to marital rape.

[There are] a lot of married men that would never consider themselves rapists because they are married. I mean a lot of people perceive rape as you go out and you attack somebody in an alley and you rape them, [if] [...] your wife says no, go ahead anyway, that’s not rape. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]

Such information was also seen as vital for children suffering incest because ‘their father says it’s all right, or their brother says it’s all right, ‘just our secret’. If they read that they would know it’s a crime’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. As one survivor of childhood sexual abuse commented the message on this poster was ‘the opposite of what I was told. I was told “Don’t get in a car with strange men”. That was the only time you would ever get harmed, if you did something like that.’ [Grp 10, Self-help group]

There was then clear support within some groups for identifying rape by friends and relatives. Research participants also often added that this information was unavailable from any other source. Three girls (aged about 14) commented on the ‘stranger danger’ lessons that they had been taught at school and expressed the view that it was important to warn children about men they knew and trusted. They said they had never been given such information at school:

f1: ‘They should really [give that information] [...] if their father came up to them [...]’

f3: They’d be too scared to tell anyone what was happening.

f4: They’d probably think it was right [...]’

f5: ‘cause you love your dad and your dad loves you and you would just think that was right and you can’t go telling anyone ‘cause that’s right’
f3: If your dad's done it, right, that wouldn't be a stranger [...] and they'll think it's right, wee bairns' [...]  
f1: 'Even if your dad comes up to you and starts touching you or something they could show them what they should do' [Grp 4, Youth Group, f].

Many of the female group participants thus welcomed the emphasis on attacks by men known to the victim because they felt this gave them the information to help to defend themselves; similarly some men also commented that this was an important message for them - making them think more closely about how to protect their own elderly relatives and young children:

*That bit at the bottom - 'husband, father, stranger'...That makes me feel uneasy, and anything that makes me feel uneasy, makes me think. That's what's really good about it. I go to work and put my bairns in the nursery, what's going on in the nursery? What's going on with my bairns?* [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

In spite of such positive responses from some research participants, others were concerned that the message encouraged unnecessary distrust and had disturbing implications.

*What can you do about the fact that 85% [of rapists] are known to their victims? What are you going to tell women? Simply don't know any men? Just forget about them? [...] 85% - I mean that is almost most of them. So what are you going to tell women? Just keep away from men? Don't have anything to do with them?* [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

In fact the campaign did not seem to make women distrust men they already knew. Although some commented that, given the figures, this was the logical conclusion it did not actually appear to have this effect. Women who already trusted the men in their lives retained their confidence that 'the men I know aren't going to behave like that.' [Grp 1, Office workers, f] and respondents often interpreted the statistics about rapes by 'known' men or murders by women's 'partners' in ways which excluded close male friends from suspicion. For example, one research participant suggested that maybe the women murdered 'by their partner or ex-partner' were often prostitutes murdered by their clients and other research participants suggested that maybe the rapists who were 'known to the victim' had only met her that evening. [See section XII.2.]
X. HOW MEN AND WOMEN ‘POSITIONED’ THEMSELVES IN RELATION TO THE ADVERTISEMENTS

The images and texts of any advertisement (or film or book) create a ‘textual’ space for the viewer (for example, a film may use camera angles to invite the viewer to identify with one character rather than another, or a slogan may be phrased in a way which places the viewer as ‘subject’ or ‘object’ of the statement). (Mulvey, 1975) However, the precise way in which any individual sees themselves located by that text is an interactive process and may vary between different audiences (Eldridge, 1993). Within the groups there was a great deal of consensus about what the advertisements said about women but there was a great deal of debate about how the Zero Tolerance campaign ‘positioned’ men.

Women: Most of the research participants felt that the advertisements had a clear message for women. The statements located women as ‘people with rights’. Statements such as ‘No man has the Right’ and ‘Zero Tolerance’ made some women feel that they had the right to resist abuse and that they were not to blame for violence perpetrated against them. The campaign made them feel more powerful.

One woman, however, commented that the use of the passive tense on the advertisements positioned women as the passive recipients of victimisation and another said that the statement, ‘By the time they reach eighteen one of them will have been subjected to sexual abuse’, made children’s vulnerability seem inevitable. [Grp 1, Office workers, f; Grp 12, Neighbours, f]

Men: The same phrases that seemed to position women as ‘people with rights’, made some research participants feel that men were excluded from the campaign and that they were all being ‘tarred with the same brush’. Some men, and some women, across a wide range of groups, felt that the advertisements placed all men in the position of ‘potential rapists’. ‘It is insulting to men who are OK men, who are good men [...] “All men are horrible” that’s what it says to me and it’s not healthy [...] It’s insulting to all men when it should have been more specific that it’s a minority’ [Grp 1, Office workers, f].

As one male research participant who felt ignored by, and excluded from, the campaign commented:

*It could be my little girl, it could be my mother, it could be my sister’s that’s raped or attacked or whatever. [But] I’m rejected on the same side as the rapist [...]. But let me tell you that my aggression toward that male is probably greater because it’s my little girl, my wife, my mother, my sister and I’ve seen what can happen to them and how they might then be nervous of me. So I want to get back to sorting out the males, that not only would attack my mother, my little girl etc., but they would attack me as well. What I’m saying is that I’m also a victim of this male abuse of power. As we all are, all of us law-abiding males who want to see an end to this attack on females [...] I want to know if there is going to be any tolerance of us who are prepared to do something about it or are we all going to be put on the same side of the fence and told that we are all criminals? [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]*

Whereas this man felt ‘excluded’ by the campaign’s statements about ‘male abuse’, others felt explicitly and unavoidably ‘included’ by this phrase. Some men felt that it was a positive challenge, making them think about their own behaviour to women and children and encouraging them examine their reaction to other men that they knew to be violent:
'Men do not want to admit that it goes on. You don't want to admit that your best pal beats the shit out of his wife. So you ignore it, you turn a blind eye to it.' [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

The advertisements thus generated considerable debate between male participants. For example, when one man saw the phrase 'Male abuse of power is a crime' he suggested that rape was sometimes more about 'getting carried away' than about the abuse of power:

A lot of the time I think it is to do with power but other times I think it is to do with sex. A man and a lassie go away together and get carried away and she says 'no' and he says 'aye'.

His colleague responded by stating that this was why he particularly approved of the campaign:

What this says to me is that in that situation any male might be tempted in that way, and that comes back to what I was saying before - there's a message for every male here [...] I don't think men can say "this is nothing to do with me". [Instead it makes you feel] "there but for the Grace of God go I. I'd better watch myself". [Grp 1, Office workers, m]
XI. PRESENTING RAPE AND ABUSE AS A 'GENDERED' ISSUE

The question about how men and women felt that they were positioned by the advertisements led into general debate within groups about whether or not it was appropriate to present rape and abuse as a 'gendered issue'; as a crime predominantly committed by men against women. Some group participants were concerned that identifying sexual abuse and violence within the home as a crime perpetrated largely by men was 'anti-male'. The phrases 'Male abuse of power is a crime' attracted particular criticism. In some cases people have apparently redesigned the posters by blanking-out the word 'Male' from that phrase. Some group participants thought that the gender of the abuser was irrelevant:

I don't think it matters if it turns out the 90% of abusers are men and 10% are women [...] Like splitting it up into 90% or 60% of abusers are blond. I don't think that really has any bearing [...] on the actual abuse. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

Others simply felt that it was counter-productive to draw attention to the 'gendered' nature of violence:

f1: We're not disagreeing at all that there are problems, or saying that it's not the true state of affairs but you don't solve it by this antagonistic...
f2: You don't help these men to sort themselves out by alienating them further.
f1: Or help the women help themselves either.[...]
f2: This is just anti-male, it's nothing more. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

It's dividing men and women further and further apart. It's giving women something to have on men. [Grp 1, Office workers, f]

Presenting sexual violence and abuse in this way was seen as 'sexist' and 'old-fashioned'.

I don't think you nowadays say “Men do this and women do that”. It's persons, people, how they are, their personalities, [...] it's abuse of people. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]

It's the 'male abuse of power' that is offensive [...] It's too limited, it's restrictive and it's way too sexist. [...] It pisses me off right now just looking at it, it really does. And it pisses me off in that sort of really aggressive feminist butch 'I hate men' way, you know, and I just think that's a non-starter as a position these days. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

Several people suggested that the campaign attacked men and it would be more productive to offer positive role models to men. One woman recommended displaying 'positive facts about good men [...] Make men that are abusers think “Oh, I wish I could be like that”'[Grp 1, Office workers, f], while a man in another group commented:

If we could be given a positive example of how our modification of our own behaviour can help women in general [...] If you can make me modify my behaviour in some way then fair enough, but also I would like to be included in your campaign. I thought we were all classified the same, as the villains and I felt alienated [...] I wasn't even given a chance to be on your side. [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]
The pendulum, according to some respondents, has swung too far against men and their
side of the story is no longer heard.

f1: The man’s position is being rubbish, I think we women have done a lot of harm
f2: We’ve done ourselves more harm than good [...] 
f3: You’ve got to bring up women to respect men [too] [...] a man has been out
there earning your bread and butter to keep you, so he comes home and he is tired.
Why should a man come home and start doing housework [...] where the wife is at
home all day? [...] If a man comes home and finds he’s got to start helping to clean
the house, and cooking and things like that, I think the one way they can vent their
frustration is to use their hand, and I think not all, not in the majority of cases,
women bring it on themselves, because they are brought up to [...] expect the men to
come in and start working. I think it’s all wrong, and I think it’s women’s job to
blame. [Grp 6, Christian Women’s Guild]

Focusing on gender and masculinity as the problem was seen by some research participants
(for very different reasons), as failing to address the root cause of the problem. A member
of the Christian Women’s Guild, for example, went on to say that she felt that the emphasis
should be on: ‘trying to build up the family [...] instead of singling out the woman [...] the
emphasis should be on the family and not on a member of the family but trying to do
something for the family in totality’. She added:

[We need to ] get back to the grass roots, of why this actually happens? [...] What
are the reasons for a man doing it? Depression? Aggravation? There’s all sorts of
things it could be, we only ever hear one side of the story, we never hear both sides.
And I think there are women who at the end of the day, they drive men to do something.
What are they going to do when they are absolutely driven to distraction? [Grp 6,
Christian Women’s Guild, f]

By contrast many participants felt that addressing the problem in gender terms was essential
to the campaign’s success. They did not feel that it was ‘anti-men’: ‘I don’t agree that it is
anti-men, it’s anti male abuse of power. [...] That’s clearly what it is’; ‘It’s not anti-men at
all, it’s just anti-abuse’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f; Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

Identifying ‘male abuse’ as the problem, from their perspective, was simply a statement of
fact:

I wouldn’t say it is an anti-male statement for the simple reason that we live in a very
patriarchal society, one which is structured around men. They are the ones
who hold power [...] They sit in government [...] So saying something like that is
not anti-men, I am just making a statement which is factual.’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s
group, f]

These research participants welcomed the general challenge that, they felt, the campaign
presented to men. Although everyone seemed to acknowledge that ‘women abuse too’
some respondents felt that it was quite justified for the Women’s Committee to give priority
to addressing the specific problem of male violence:

You do have to recognise the predominance of men in abusive roles of being violent
towards women and children. OK, there are women who are violent towards women
and children but it’s not anywhere near the same kind of percentage [...] We are
Talking about violence against women and children and it mostly comes from men so it has to be looked at. It's not just a coincidence that it's mostly men. [Grp 7, Women's Aid workers, f]

Some women were particularly pleased that the campaign did not simply place the onus on females to protect themselves but identified such violence as a wider social problem, for which men had to take responsibility too. As one Transport worker commented: 'it's not just about women not tolerating violence from men ... it's about men not tolerating violent men' [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]. A point expanded by some Women's Aid workers:

f1: Men should take responsibility, that it is a male abuse of power. And it is the whole structure of maleness. And males don't address, they don't take on the responsibility. And that includes males who don't abuse. [...] .
f2: And by being silent they are consenting.
f1: And because men are in the positions of power [...] through the judicial system, because of the under-representation of women, it is up to them. They have to start looking at it. We can't feel guilty because men are feeling guilty. [Grp 7, Women's Aid workers, f]

Some of these respondents thought that if the campaign did annoy some people, this was not a good reason for modifying it:

I don't understand why men would feel threatened by that. Unless they themselves are trying to force a right for something for themselves. If a man is really truly sympathetic towards women who are abused by other men, I don't see why they should feel threatened. [Grp 7, Women's Aid workers, f]

Some research participants were thus quite clear that any attempt to 'water down' the campaign would undermine the whole point of the message. They felt that some degree of annoyance from some people should be accepted as an inevitable result of challenging male privilege. Thus, when I asked a group of women from a working class areas of Edinburgh - 'what if men take exception to the campaign?' one woman immediately responded with the one word 'tough!', while another said that if men objected to it as anti-male 'It's just because you're taking their male domination away from them!' [Grp 2, residents, f]
XII. PUBLIC RESPONSES TO SOME OF THE CAMPAIGN STATISTICS AND STATEMENTS

XII. 1. Street survey findings about public reactions to the statistics presented by the Campaign

The street survey interviewees were asked to state how strongly they agreed or disagreed with some of the statements that appeared on the Zero Tolerance Campaign placards on Princes street. These included the statements: “85% of rapists are men known to their victims” (see Table 6a) and “Almost 50% of women murdered are killed by a partner or ex-partner” (see Table 6b). Relatively few people (11%) disagreed with either statement. However, around a third of people were unsure and said that they neither agreed nor disagreed with each of them (Tables 6a and 6b). Women were more likely than men to agree with the statement about rapists being known to their victims. Owner occupiers were more likely than non owner-occupiers to agree with the statement about women being murdered by partners and ex-partners. Younger people were more likely to agree with both statements in comparison with older people.

In addition, those who were most positive about the Campaign were much more inclined to agree with the statements (p<0.001) while those who expressed any negative feelings about the Campaign (as defined in Table 5) often disagreed with, or were equivocal about, the statements. The remaining group who had expressed some equivocal feelings for the Campaign (although no negative feelings as such) were the most likely to be unsure in their responses to these statements (the ‘neither agree nor disagree’ category accounting for 55% and 67% for each statement respectively).

XII. 2. Focus group findings about public reactions to the statistics presented by the campaign

XII. 2. 1. Scepticism about the statistics and dislike of the way they had been framed:

Within the focus groups people often explained their reasons for disagreeing with the statistics or giving an equivocal response in terms of a general scepticism about statistics: “statistics can be used to prove almost anything” [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]. Some research participants also made comments such as: ‘The only thing that leads me to doubt them is that they are such round numbers [...] I’d be interested to know what percentage error there are on these’ [Grp 1, Office workers, m] or ‘Some of the statistics which have been quoted have carefully selected to further the point of view which the organisers of the campaign want to get across.’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

In the group discussion it became clear that those who ‘disagreed’ with any of the statistics presented in the campaign often believed them to be factually accurate but were angry about the way they had been presented. These research participants felt the display of such information was divisive. The posters made them angry - not about the violence identified by the statistics, but about the way they had been framed. As one office worker commented:

‘I’m not disputing the facts of anything. But the way they’ve done it is wrong. It’s very negative’. [Grp 1, Office workers, f] While a worker in a marriage counselling

---

4 Respondents were also asked to comment on the statement: ‘Domestic violence accounts for a quarter of all reported crimes’ which also appeared on the Princes Street placards. However, this statement is actually incorrect; it should have read ‘a quarter of all reported violent crimes’. This report, therefore, does not include any analysis of this question.
service stated: ‘As an organisation we’re used to this sort of information, this doesn’t surprise us […] We’re not learning anything, and all it’s doing is making us feel kind of angry.’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]  

By contrast those who felt positive about the campaign stressed their anger about the implications of the statistics rather than the way that they had been publicised: ‘I look at that and [...] I’m angry, I want people to know all this’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]. Some people found the figures gave them new information about which they had previously been unaware. Others said they had already known the statistics but the posters made them think about the implications of such endemic abuse. Only some expressed surprise:

f: ‘I thought what was good about the statistics was that they were so shocking’ [...]  
m: ‘I would assume [from the figures] that there’s a lot more [violence] going on than I realised.’ [Grp 1, Office workers]

XII. 2.2. The importance of personal knowledge:

The fact that Edinburgh District Council were responsible for promoting the statements contained in the Zero Tolerance Campaign meant that some people were predisposed to believe the statistics, because they were seen to come from an authoritative source. However, even more important than this was whether or not people had personal knowledge of violence against women. Personal contact was often the touchstone for believing or disbelieving the statistics or being surprised by the figures. Thus one man who had discussed the campaign with a friend as they walked along Princes street commented: ‘He’s the same as me, he’s not actually heard of many cases but he’s surprised by the figures [...] We don’t know any people at all who’ve abused or been abused.’ [Grp 1, Office workers, m]. Similarly, a woman rejected statistics suggesting that 50% of women experience some type of sexual abuse (‘from flashing to rape’) commenting: ‘I’ve never met anyone who’s been flashed at.’ [Grp 5, Transport workers, f]. By contrast research participants who had been abused, or knew people who had been, were predisposed to accept the figures. Thus, for example, one man, who’s mother had been a battered woman, had no problem accepting that such violence was widespread and hidden behind closed doors, while a woman who had discussed the issue with friends had come to realise that at least half of the women she knew had been abused in some form or other.

The impact of knowing people who were prepared to talk about abuse was further illustrated during the course of the group discussions themselves. Some research participants said that they had changed their mind and now accepted the statistics, because during the group discussions friends and colleagues had revealed their own experiences. It seems that it would help the public to believe the statistics if friends were able to be open about what had happened to them. Alternatively, it would help the public to accept the figures if they understood that often even close friends may not reveal their own abuse.

XII. 2.3. Possibilities for Misreading:

One woman felt the statistics were open to being misread - so that people might think that they referred to the number of men who were rapists, for example, rather than the number of rapes. Her experience of misreading the statistics in this way was not shared by any of the other group participants. However, it was interesting to note that people often remembered the statistics as being less dramatic than they were. Thus, when people remembered the strap-line ‘By the time they reach eighteen one of them will have been subjected to sexual abuse’ they often said that the picture had shown three children or five or even ten children rather than just two.
XII. 2. 4. Evasions and Re-readings:

Group participants frequently made comments which minimised the relevance of the figures to their own lives. For example, discussing the figures about women murdered by their partners one girl commented: ‘But most of them are prostitutes’. When another member of the group responded by saying ‘but that’s not their partner’, she replied ‘It’s people they’re with’ and her friend added ‘a partner is someone you have nookie with’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, J]. Another participant reacted to the same statistic by suggesting that the basic numbers were so small that it was not really significant: ‘Fifty percent could be [just] ten women, it doesn’t mean anything [...] Say there’s twenty women murdered and only ten were killed by their partners, that’s fifty percent’. [Grp 1, Office workers, J]

Several people commented that if you took the statistics at face value they seemed horrifying but it was probably not as simple as that. A police officer, for example, suggested that maybe the rapists were ‘known to the victim’ only because they had pre-planned the assault and introduced themselves to the woman that same evening (a view that was echoed by several women in other groups as they discussed the implication of the statistics). People’s ability to flexibly interpret terms such as ‘know’ or ‘partner’ have also been documented in evaluations of other public awareness campaigns. For example, the message in many AIDS advertising was that people should use condoms unless they had a ‘steady partners’.

The sub-text of many advertisements was that people that one ‘knew’ were somehow ‘safer’ than casual acquaintances. Research shows, however, that people have very variable understandings of terms such as ‘partner’, ‘going steady’ and what it means to ‘know’ someone. There was a tendency for people to accept someone as ‘safe’ if they were part of their friendship network, or if they had gone out with them a couple of times. (Ingham et al., 1991). In this way it would seem that people are reacting similarly to the AIDS campaign and Zero Tolerance Campaign captions. In both cases, for very different reasons, people are defining someone one knows or a ‘partner’ in a very wide sense.

In addition to the reactions described above some people suggested that the statistics displayed by the Zero Tolerance campaign were not as bad as they might seem because the figures included ‘bogus’ cases: alleged child sexual abuse which was not really abuse and rape which was not really rape. Members of the Christian Women’s Guild, for example, suggested that the figures about rape must include incidents when the woman had ‘cried rape’ after giving a man ‘the come on’:

\[f1\]: They’ll go so far and then say no. They don’t say no at the very beginning and that’s bound to be included in that statistic. Women who have reported it because they have agreed at the beginning and then turned round and say no[...]

\[f2\]: Well there was a case in the paper just about a fortnight ago [...] about a young lady lawyer and a male lawyer and she allowed him to stay the night in her apartment [...] she undressed in front of him and so he assumed that was an invitation and so he tried it on and she sued him for rape.

\[f3\]: It didn’t come out till after the case but he’s been a bad boy once or twice before.

\[f2\]: And has she done it before?

\[f3\]: Well, you see that won’t come out.

\[f1\]: No. And you see her name was withheld.

\[f4\]: See, again we’re very oriented to women.

\[JK\]: What do you mean by saying ‘has she done it before’?  

\[f2\]: Well I mean has she gone out with men and had this wonderful time, said ‘come back for the evening’ and stripped off and then said ‘no, I’m sorry, but that’s it’. I
mean you hear of the one-sidedness, I mean it just gets me so mad. I'm not saying that all,... I mean the 85%, I really don't know about statistics. I think you can prove and disprove anything by statistics. But I honestly feel that there are two sides and there are some clever lawyers out there who can twist stories. I'm sorry for the woman that is genuinely raped [...] but by the same token, if [...] the situation grows and grows and grows and he's getting the come on, I think that girl's got everything she deserves. [Grp 6, Christian Women's Guild, f]

XII. 3. Reactions to the statement: 'Male Abuse of Power is a Crime'

'Male': As discussed earlier there was widespread debate about the reference to 'male' in this phrase. People repeatedly asked 'what about women who beat up men?' and 'what about females who abuse their power'. Often this was simply part of a general complaint that focusing on male violence was 'sexist'. However, one group produced a quite different critique of this phrase. Members of NZERU A BABAE (Shakti women's group) commented that reference to 'male' abuse of power was quite justified on the posters about rape but that the use of the phrase on the poster about 'emotional, physical' or 'sexual' abuse excluded lesbian women who might be abused by their partner and that it excluded female-to-female abuse within the extended family:

Within some of our cultures, we are Asian or whatever, there is a hierarchy within the house, and if you happen to be the top female.... [...] For white people, yes, it is legitimate maybe just to relegate it to males' abuse of power [...] but for people like us it is not true, it is not reality. I live with my aunts and uncles and whatever and my husband could be the last person meting out the abuse. [Grp 11, Shakti women's group, f]

It was not only the use of the word 'male' in this caption which attracted comment. There were also very different understandings of the term 'power' and 'crime' within different groups.

'Power': Part of the explanation for the diverse reactions to the statement is that people come to it with very different understandings of power. For example, some people could not relate to the concept of 'male power' at all. Power, they said, made them think of institutional hierarchies and bureaucracies, which had nothing to do with maleness or femaleness. Many research participants simply interpreted 'power' as meaning physical strength. Only some identified the term as encompassing a whole range of powers including economic and social leverage, men's dominance in government, the law, medicine etc.

Although some women found the concept of 'male power' useful and highly relevant to their own understandings of the world, others found the whole concept strange and still others felt it denied female power. One woman, in fact, felt that naming 'male power' actually gave men power:

'A man reading that might think 'I really do feel powerful [...] if all these people that have made up these posters think that men are powerful' to which her friend replied 'No. I think it gives women strength reading that. 'Male abuse of power' don't accept it, it's just not on. It's making you aware of your rights as a woman, you don't have to accept it, you don't have to lie back. [Grp 12, Neighbours, f]

'Crime': The group of police officers seemed to feel positive about the use of the word 'crime'. One officer pointed out that although the phrase 'male abuse of power is a crime'
was not strictly accurate it was still very effective: *It conjures up images: police, courts, the full weight of the legal system.* [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]. Members of some of the other groups were more sceptical. They often stressed that although the statement represented an ideal state of affairs they did not trust the law to treat domestic violence as a crime and one woman declared that the concept of ‘crime’ was far too weak: "Male abuse of power is a crime"? *Well, so is parking on double yellow lines* [Grp 12, Neighbours, f]. For these group participants the statement ‘male abuse of power is a crime’ was less powerful than it might have been precisely because it conjured up images of judges, the police and the courts and these instruments of the law could not be trusted. This led to group participants expressing their anger about police (in)action in cases of domestic violence, the lack of legal sanction and the ‘stupidity’ of some judges. The slogan ‘male abuse of power is a crime’ may serve as a focus for people’s discontents about what they see as the failure of the law in this area. Thus the slogan may mobilise action or at least complaint, even if it lacks the immediate ‘sharpness’ and ‘power’ of the slogan ‘No Man has the Right’.

**XII. 4. Reactions to the statement ‘No Man has the Right’**

The statement ‘No man has the right’ was widely identified as the most effective statement in the entire campaign⁵. In particular it seemed that many women found it more ‘empowering’ to be encouraged to claim their ‘rights’ rather than to report a ‘crime’:

‘That one [no man has the right] - there is no judge, not even Virginia Bottomley or Major can decide for you, it is just there. Whilst that one [‘Male abuse of power is a crime’] is open to argument.’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

The phrase was often greeted with cries of enthusiasm: ‘Yeah’ ‘Aye’ ‘That’s definitely right’ ‘That’s right’ [Grp 2, residents, f]; ‘It’s like some injection of power, that brings you courage, and you just feel great.’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

Some women talked very personally about how much this phrase meant to them:

To me that was the most vivid one. [...] Simple and straight to the point - ‘No man has the right.’ [...] Years ago someone said something similar to that to me and that really changed..... it didn’t change my life overnight but it changed the way I thought. [...] It said to me I had rights. [...] it was like a realisation. I’m not meaning to be dramatic, but I remember thinking ‘that’s right!’ It suddenly sunk in. It helped me to see that and to see that poster up there... I hope it hits one woman who has never seen the thing that way: ‘That’s right, he doesn’t have the right.’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

Some group participants very clearly felt that the statement ‘No Man has the Right’ meant that they, as women, did have rights, or, as one woman said, ‘It sets you on par with a man’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

---

⁵ This phrase was also seen as less controversial than ‘Male abuse of power is a crime’ if only because some people read ‘man’ as meaning ‘people’: ‘I must say I think the ‘No man has the right’ is a bit less sexist [...] because here I’m reading ‘man’ as generic [like] ‘no man is an island’ [...] I feel more comfortable with ‘No man has the right’ - it’s no person. [Grp 3, f]
JK: What do you think of that one, ‘No man has the right’? [...]

f1: It lets you know you’re a person in your own right [...], it says ‘No Man has the Right a if he’s doing it, that means he’s wrong. Because you’ve got to get to the stage where you admit that he’s wrong rather than you’re doing something wrong to make him do that.

f2: Having spoken to my friend who went through that, [I realise that] the biggest problem is to make women accept that it’s not them, it’s him. OK, initially you’ve got faults, but at this stage it’s him, it’s not you. If he’s the one knocking hell out of you. It’s his problem. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]

Interestingly some people complained that the phrase was vague and asked questions such as ‘No man has the right’ to what?’. Others, however, described the slogan as ‘precise’ and ‘to the point’. What they seemed to mean by this, was that they welcomed the broad, all encompassing nature of the phrase and that, in the context of the campaign, it was very clear to them what it meant:

f1: It is very precise, it is clear, no bones about it

f2: It covers everything, doesn’t it. No man has the right to verbally abuse you, sexually, physically, emotionally, whatever. No right to behave as if they are better than you. We have to keep saying that to ourselves. [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group]

f1: That’s really good. That’s really bald and can encompass a lot of things. To the point. Very open, covers a lot of things. [...] it makes you think.

f2: Of all forms of abuse, what constitutes abuse. It’s like no man has the right to anything.

f1: Without being given permission, no matter what it is.
[Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers]

Although there appeared to be some gender division in response to this phrase it was also welcomed enthusiastically by some male research participants. ‘I think it’s right on the button’ commented one man, saying it had made him think about how he relates to his children and adding:

‘That’s the one for me ‘No man has the right’ - No man has the right to demand so much from a woman, it’s as simple as that. No man has a right to rape a woman, no man has the right to abuse children. [...] If a woman says no to you that’s that.’
[Grp 5, Transport workers, m]
XIII. GENERAL REACTIONS TO THE PICTURE-POSTER ADVERTISEMENTS

XIII. 1. Common themes: the cosy pictures and the ‘text/image disjuncture’

Respondents often reported being surprised by the pictures that were used to illustrate this series of advertisements. The photographs were identified as the sort of images used to sell fire-places, furniture, paint or insurance: ‘It’s like an advert for a rug or natural wood’ [Grp 2, residents, f] ‘Buy this fireplace quickly, it’s only on sale for a couple of weeks’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, f] ‘It’s like a Dulux shade card’ [Grp 12, Neighbours, f], ‘It could be an advert for Habitat / Or insurance or a building society’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

The domesticity of the scene, use of black and white photography (signalling ‘old-fashioned’ and ‘traditional’) and details such as the ‘Victorian toys’ and the fireplace all suggested ‘safety’, ‘warmth’ and ‘security’.

‘Well, there’s domestic bliss. You know, there’s kids playing in a safe environment with their dolly, and it’s a nice….., what appears to be on the surface to be nice, a nice room.’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

‘A happy home, isn’t it? You can imagine mum down the stairs, just about to shout up “Tea’s ready”’. [Grp 13, Neighbours, f]

Looking at the picture on its own, knowing that the advertisement was part of a campaign about abuse, people often suggested that the caption must read something like ‘Not all children are this lucky’, ‘It would be nice if all little girls felt this safe’ or ‘She’s one of the lucky ones’. Alternatively they thought that the pictures must fit into a ‘Before and After scenario’ - ‘maybe she’s next in line’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

They were often startled by the actual caption and stated that the rather beautiful and serene scenes portrayed in the pictures did not seem to ‘fit’ with the brutality and violence of the words. Some people commented that the photographs were ‘bland’, ‘mellow’ and ‘mild’ [Grp 2, residents, f].

This is partly a function of what people expect to see. They expected vivid images of suffering and assumed that they would be able to tell just by looking that the person on the poster was a victim. For example some people expected a child who was sexually abused to be ‘withdrawn’ and limp, sitting in the corner with her head down (rather like the images used on the television News and in some children’s charity advertisements). Indeed some people tried very hard to read the Zero Tolerance photographs in this way - looking for signs of abuse: ‘The little girl doesn’t look secure to me - sucking her thumb and the way she’s sitting’ [Grp 16, students, m]; ‘That’s the one whose been abused - She’s very withdrawn.’ [Grp 2, residents, f]

However, try as they might, people usually had difficulty finding such signs: ‘She doesn’t look like a victim’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. This led some people to complain about the disjuncture between the images and the words ‘I think it ought to show something nasty…’ [Grp 2, residents, f] ‘I think it’s bad, that one. I don’t think the visual picture goes with the message’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]. However this very contrast could make these advertisements particularly thought-provoking and effective.

Firstly the use of comfortable-looking rather than dramatic imagery seemed to draw some people in to looking at the picture when they might have turned away from more brutal imagery (certainly other research suggests that people turn away from images that are too
frightening or confrontational) (McEwan & Bhopal, 1991). Within the groups people were evidently sometimes quite attracted by the picture and discussed the furnishings (‘I like that style - I like the settee’ [Grp 2, residents, f]). They were only shocked after reading the text.

These posters with the pictures - talking about the violence and with the non-violent pictures there. In a way they made me think. Even today they made me think more about it. If it had been a sort of violent picture I would just have sort of dismissed it because I don’t like violence, you know, I don’t like dwelling on it particularly. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f].

Another woman described how this affected her sister who was visiting Edinburgh:

We passed one of these posters and she was looking at it, saying and thinking about what a lovely looking room that was and then she sort of realised what it said and it was kind of a shock. So I think it’s quite good, because it draws them in and then it shocks them out of their comfortable idea of what life is like [...] Life can [...] look really comfortable but underneath the surface, for a lot of women, it’s really torment and hell. I think it’s quite a good wee twist. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

It was this sort of experience that led one research participant to conclude: ‘I think it does have an impact simply because of the juxtaposition [...] I think their impact is because the picture is different from the language’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]. While another commented: ‘It looks like, on the surface, a kind of happy wee [home] and there’s this kind of counterpoint statement which is really strong, shocking’ [Grp 16, Students, m].

The use of cosy, traditional imagery in combination with the shocking words disrupts people’s assumptions and can confront them with their own stereotypes about ‘the look’ of an abused girl or woman: ‘They look just like an ordinary wee couple of girls - like any body’s kids, and you realise something’s going to happen to them - it could happen to your kid’ [Grp 2, residents, f]. It seemed to help people to realise that any one might be a victim of such treatment: ‘Obviously there’s a lot could be going on there that you don’t know about’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]; ‘You never know what goes on in anybody else’s life’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]; ‘It’s not necessarily obvious. I mean your friend’s child could be experiencing it and you wouldn’t be able to detect it’ [Grp 12, Neighbours, f]. The pictures provoked discussion about how children, for example, might hide the fact that they were being abused or how a violent man may be careful not to leave bruises on a woman’s face. As one research participant pointed out, in response to a friend’s complaint about the lack of visible bruises in the picture: ‘I used to get hit where it didn’t show: my back, my arms’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

However, it is perhaps precisely because much of the pain caused by abuse is hidden in everyday life that some women still wanted ‘stronger’ images. Some women wanted ‘shock tactics’ (‘like the drunk-driving campaign’). A couple of women volunteered personal experience of how they had hidden their own cuts and bruises: ‘I got beat up once by a boyfriend quite badly and [...] I hid from him, I wouldn’t let him see the mess he’d made of me. [...] I regretted it afterwards. I should have let him see how far he went, [...] but I knew I was so bad that I couldn’t let my mum or dad see. [...] The less people that knew about it the better, that was my attitude. I’ve just got to find somewhere to hide. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. Feeling that their own assailant had never been confronted with
the consequences of their actions they wanted to see posters which would force men to
face up to the pain and misery caused by violence against women and children: ‘You show
some poor bugger sitting in a tiny wee room with three children, two carrier bags...’
[Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

In particular there was some concern that the image of the woman who had been
‘hospitalised’ was too sanitised: ‘I think it’s quite bad [...] because like typical males
would say ‘she can’t be that bad, you can’t see anything.’ If you’ve got nothing to show
it can’t have been bad, ‘probably deserved it, must have been just a slap or something’
[Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

However, other research participants were doubtful whether this would work: ‘If they
have a conscience, you’d have to find it first’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. These
participants also wanted the whole range of abuse to be validated - not just the type that
left you with a broken jaw: ‘you don’t have to have bruises, black eyes to feel in an abusive
situation’[Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. Some women were also reluctant to see yet more
images of women as victims: ‘If they want to see women suffering why don’t they turn on
the TV or go and see a film or what have you [...] They’ll see women being tortured, being
killed, serial killers bumping them off ... and that’s entertainment. I’m fed up of seeing
women suffering.’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]. [For further discussion of this point see section
XIV. 1. 1.]

XIII. 2. Identification with the pictures: middle-class

All the picture were usually, although not invariably, identified as middle-class (some
people expressed initial doubt about this, thinking, for example, that the bare floor boards
indicated that the family were too poor to afford a carpet). Working-class research
participants did not immediately suggest that they were alienated by the middle-class
imagery. In fact they were far more likely to say that the room in the picture was unlike
their own home because of factors other than the apparent wealth of the surroundings e.g.
‘It’s not a normal bedroom - they’re not fighting’ [Grp 2, residents, f] or ‘[it’s not realistic]
because children’s bedrooms are always messy, cause a child always leaves a room messy,
even I do, if my room’s clear I can’t stand it. It’s not the same place’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, f].

If questioned closely respondents agreed that the images showed homes far more wealthy
than their own (‘It would take a week’s wages to buy a dolls house like that’). However,
people are, of course, used to seeing very middle-class homes portrayed in magazines and
adverts and the middle-class decor is usually presented as the ideal to which one should
aspire. The fact that the pictures showed stereotypically middle-class homes did not
necessarily prevent some people who were less well off from identifying with them. One
man in the Transport and Railway workers group responded to the picture of the old woman
and young girl by saying: ‘That’s my wean. [pointing at the child] [...] I’ve just left my
weans in the house with their grandmother [...] That’s my house, there’s my horrible mother-
in-law and there’s one of my weans’. Later, looking at the advertisement showing the two

3 The scenes were also usually, although not invariably, identified as being set inside the home. (A few people thought that the absence of a mother-figure in two of the pictures suggested the children were in an institution. The wealth and relative tidiness of one of the scenes made a youth worker suggest that the children were in a psychologist’s clinic because ‘it’s not a home, it’s too tidy’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, f].
girls playing together he commented: 'I see an advert like that and I tense up because these wee girls there (pointing at the two girls) that's my son and wee daughter. That's any body's kids.' [Grp 5, Transport workers, m].

The middle-class symbolism of the pictures did not, then, seem to alienate working-class participants. In fact, some particularly welcomed this aspect of the campaign. Given the stereotypes that violence and abuse within the home is a working-class problem, the middle class imagery was identified as an important challenge to this presumption: 'It makes you realise that it's not just poor class women'; 'It's not always a drunken bricklayer who comes home on a Friday night and beats up his wife; 'It could be someone living in a mansion, it could be someone living in a hovel.' [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f; Grp 1, Office workers, m; Grp 5, Transport workers, m]

This led to comments such as: 'If women like this can be abused too...[it's] showing it's universal' and 'Even if a girl's brought up nice, [...] she can still be abused'. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f; Grp 2, residents, f]

Far from seeing the 'middle-class' imagery as a problem, many research participants thought it was a vital part of the campaign: showing that children are vulnerable to abuse even if they are well cared for and making it clear that it is 'everybody's' problem.

f1: The NSPCC posters always show kids that are really poor. It's like poverty-stricken kids and I'm not denying that it happens to them but it's always this image that the kids are dirty, not clean and well looked after. And I'm glad that this image has come across now rather than these poor wee scruffy kids' [...]  
f2: 'I think the danger of using like a housing scheme [image] would be apart from reinforcing stereotypes it would ..., a lot of people wouldn't feel that it was really their problem [...] so having it focused on middle class images is redressing the whole thing, redressing the balance. [Grp 7, Women's Aid workers]

XIII. 3. Identification with the pictures: white

The 'whiteness' of the images appeared to be more of a problem than their middle-class emphasis. As one member of the Shakti women's group commented: 'I wouldn't associate that with my own home or my mother's [...] they are very whitey, whitey'. She added that if the images had clearly included black people:

I would have taken slightly more notice, I would have related to it maybe a little bit more. I related to the issue and what it was saying though very well in general. But the pictures were just average: what you see in a magazine, white people, that's it. You just get so used to it [...] You don't even consciously think about it until later [...] But there is like a screen between me and the picture, but not the actual message. It was good but [I am] like detached from it. [Grp 11, Shakti women's group, f]

Another member of this group pointed out that:

The other problem with the ads being whitey whitey is [...] because domestic violence is a very evil, silent issue amongst the black community. They keep it right under the carpet. And maybe [because there is] no reference [to black people] on the poster [that] has just sealed that. [...] The flip side of that would have been if there were a black face then you would still have got a backlash but at least it would have helped for some groups who are blowing the trumpet to actually feel much more supported.
One woman added that she also wanted to see the links made between different women’s experiences: ‘whether she is white or pink or something she is going through the same thing that you are going through as a black woman, bringing you closer together. Especially because we have been saying it is something that happens world-wide, therefore it is not just a particular issue for a particular group. Therefore the posters could have done a big favour by trying to encompass the universality of the problem. Just a bit of colour!’ [Grp 11, Shakti women’s group, f]

XIII. 4. Layout and design

The overall layout and design of the advertisements seemed to work well. However, the text for the captions seemed to be too small. In contrast to the praise for the style, size and repeated appearance of the Z, participants were critical of the size and placing of some of the other words. People seemed happy with the number of words: ‘just about the right amount of words. You might actually read those; I think it’s very arresting’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]. However, they were less happy with the size of the text on the picture-posters displayed on the bill-boards:

The writing’s too small, you know, for a poster, […] it’s a lovely photograph and the Z is great – but I think it’s message wouldn’t come over quickly because a lot of people don’t bother to read the writing. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

The placing of the lower strap-line (e.g. ‘From Flashing to Rape’ and ‘Emotional, physical, sexual’) also seemed to be problematic. It was noticeable that some respondents who could recall the main caption seemed unfamiliar with the lower strap-line and even when people had the advertisement in front of them some of them failed to read the lower line. For example when reading the line beneath the picture of the two girls - ‘one of them will be subjected to sexual abuse’ - some respondents asked questions such as ‘well, what do they mean by “sexual abuse?”’. In one group, when another person pointed out the caption ‘From flashing to rape’ her friend replied ‘I’ve never even noticed that’ to which another member of the group responded: ‘It’s too far away. It should be really highlighted. You just don’t have enough time to catch them all, when you look at that you read that and then […] you forget about the bottom bit. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

This problem may be exacerbated by the fact that every thing else at that level of the poster is a constant feature on all of them - it is only the first few words on this line that differ between posters.
From three to ninety three,

women are raped.

HUSBAND, FATHER, STRANGER
MALE ABUSE OF POWER IS A CRIME

EDINBURGH DISTRICT COUNCIL WOMEN'S COMMITTEE
WORKING FOR ZERO TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

By the time they reach eighteen,

one of them will have been
subjected to sexual abuse

FROM FLASHING TO RAPE
MALE ABUSE OF POWER IS A CRIME

EDINBURGH DISTRICT COUNCIL WOMEN'S COMMITTEE
WORKING FOR ZERO TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

She lives with a successful businessman,
loving father and respected member of the community.

Last week he hospitalised her.

EMOTIONAL, PHYSICAL, SEXUAL
MALE ABUSE OF POWER IS A CRIME

EDINBURGH DISTRICT COUNCIL WOMEN'S COMMITTEE
WORKING FOR ZERO TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN
XIV. SPECIFIC FEEDBACK ON INDIVIDUAL POSTERS

XIV.1. ‘She lives with a successful business man …’

This advertisement was welcomed for posing an explicit challenge to the stereotype that only ‘drunken brick-layers’ beat their wives or girlfriends. It was seen as thought-provoking and clear. The inclusion of the concept of ‘emotional’ abuse worked well.

XIV.1.1. Detailed responses to the image:

The woman in this photograph was perceived as very lonely and isolated: ‘She seems to be shutting herself away’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]. Some people thought she looked depressed (especially as she was not watching television). She was widely assumed to have (well-paid) work outside the home (her skirt was described as a ‘business skirt’ and a couple of people thought that the coal scuttle was a brief case). This representation of her as a ‘working woman’ was welcomed by the Women’s Aid workers for highlighting that it is not just economic dependence that traps women with abusive men:

> The point is even if she has the money to leave she’s still going to be terrified ‘is he going to find me? What’s going to happen if he does find me? Is he going to kill me this time?’ You know, he’s hospitalised her .... That’s her living in terror, just living in terror. [Women’s Aid workers, f]

The fact that she and her home appeared conventionally attractive was also noted. She obviously had not ‘let herself go’ and this meant that ‘She doesn’t look like someone likely to be antagonistic, to warrant hospitalisation.’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]

Some scepticism was expressed about whether she was a mother, some people interrogated the picture for evidence of children in the house and decided that this was highly unlikely: ‘She doesn’t look like a loving mother’; ‘Maybe her bairns have been taken away from her ‘cos she’s been beaten’ [Grp 2, residents, f; Grp 4, Youth Group, f]

*f1: It doesn't look like a family home to me. [...] It's too neat. It's a nice home but it's not homely. There's not a fireguard over that fire.*

*f2: You can imagine the scratches on that floor with kids!*

*f1: It doesn't look like a typical home with kids; you just don't get the time to do things like that, you know, the clutter and the kids' pictures stuck up on the wall.*

*f2: It's a very cold home. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]*

This was the advertisement which attracted most debate about the disjuncture between the image and the text. The woman was assumed to be waiting at home for her husband/partner:

*f1: She's waiting for him coming in and slap her again....*

*f2: to say 'silly old cow, where's me dinner - slap round the gob because it's not ready. 'Get to bed', 'I don't want it tonight, sunshine', 'well, you're having it'. [Grp 2, residents, f]*

Some research participants, particularly those with professional knowledge about battering, felt the image was quite realistic because women might struggle to keep up appearances:

*f1: She's probably someone that everyone thinks is very friendly, very nice, and would never guess in a million years that she was abused. She probably wouldn't dream of letting anybody know. She hides it well. [...]
f2: I liked the relaxed way she was sitting [because] it showed it could be anybody.[...] It looks like she’s in total control of her life whereas this is a woman that’s abused. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

By contrast others criticised her relaxed appearance because they felt that it did not reflect the appropriate apprehension:

f1: She wouldn’t be relaxed like that with her shoes off - he’d come in and say ‘what are your shoes doing in the middle of the floor? What a mess.

f2: She’s be watching the clock rather than reading - she’d be anxiously waiting for him to come home [Grp 2, residents, f]

For a few people the fact that the woman seemed to be sitting there calmly waiting for her assailant to come home raised questions about her acceptance of the violence:

If you’ve knocked hell out of your wife and put her in hospital and a week later she’s sitting there reading the paper with her shoes off, [then] it obviously did nothing to her did it? She’s still there. [...] That makes it look acceptable, it advertises that its acceptable, because she’s still sitting there a week later and she’s perfectly relaxed [...] I look at that and I see somebody who’s accepted the fact she’s been put in hospital [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

This point of view throws light on discussions which occurred in several groups around the question of ‘why does she stay?’ Although the old woman and children represented in other pictures were seen as innocent victims, the woman on this poster attracted less sympathy and raised more questions about her own ‘provocation’ of, or ‘collusion’ with, the violence against her. It seems that some people need more information if they are to comprehend what traps women with abusive men and that, as it stands, this advertisement does not challenge such assumptions for those people. In addition to providing more information, perhaps through leaflets and personal testimonies in the mass media it may also be possible to adapt the image to show her apprehension, or to introduce a child into the picture as some respondents understood that a woman would try to hide her unhappiness from her children.

XIV. 1.2. ‘Emotional’:

Some people were not completely familiar with the term ‘emotional abuse’. This led to some discussion which invariably resulted in the research participants welcoming the identification of this form of abuse. Naming ‘emotional’ abuse was seen as important because of its prevalence and the fact it is harder to spot. As some members of Gingerbread who had experienced such abuse explained:

f1: I think it takes longer to realise how much you are being emotionally abused when you don’t realise what you are going through. Like brain washing. [...] 

f2: Constant criticism.

f3: Fear.

f1: Fear of a man taking over a woman’s life, you are just made to feel worthless, you can’t think for yourself.

f2: You get to a stage where you genuinely believe that you are totally useless, you can’t do anything right, you can’t say anything right.

f1: Just lose all confidence in yourself.
f2: [...] I didn’t see it at first. I just thought well he was my man and the master and I didn’t realise how far I had sunk in that sense. [...] 

f3: ‘I still blame myself a lot, from the way my marriage went down, because [...] I let him treat me like a doormat.

f2: ‘I know that I did it myself [...] because if he couldn’t get what he wanted life was hell, so it was just easier to give in. [...] I ended up at a stage where you are living on a tight-rope, scared stiff that what you will say or do is the wrong thing, and you sit there and rehearse what you are going to say, and this is your own husband. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members]

It is very important to have a language to describe what it happening. For one woman that language had been provided by her divorce lawyer who referred to ‘mental cruelty’: ‘When I was discussing it he told me ‘that’s mental cruelty’ and actually when he read back what I had been telling him, I was horrified. He [my husband] is such a nice person, everybody says he’s great.’ [Grp 9, Gingerbread members]

XIV. 1. 3. ‘hospitalised’: Most research participants liked the clear statement that the woman had been so severely abused that she had ended up in hospital.

In our society these days there is so much violence around that you have to say something that seems severe in order to catch people’s attention. It sounds quite catching to me ‘Last week he hospitalised her’; whereas if you said ‘Last week he gave her a black eye’, well, you know, lots of people get black eyes ... so hospitalising is quite dramatic. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]
XIV. 2. ‘From 3 to 93...’

XIV. 2. 1. The age range:

This poster met with wide approval from most of the participants in the group discussions. They welcomed the attention it gave to the threat to old as well as young women and found it a very shocking and disturbing message: ‘I think that is good at getting over the sense that you are not safe at any age’. However, one survivor said she found the image ‘quite painful [because of] the mothers and grandmothers who choose, for whatever reason, to hide the abuse [...] so when I look at this woman I don’t know whether she has the abuse in common with the child and can allow the child to share it with her, or whether she’s [...] helping the denial.’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

For many research participants the advertisement brought home the ‘horror’ of rape because both the old woman and the young girl were perceived as ‘innocent victims’ who could not possibly ‘provoke’ sexual assault.

They are not asking for it, but some of these girls walking along Prince St [...] with wee short skirts. [...] some women dress very provocative. And I think they are asking for it, by the way they dress, because they [men] are titillated by what they see [...] I think it’s very sickening that children and people in the twilight of their lives should be attacked in such a way, women who weren’t brought up to that. [Grp 6, Christian Women’s Guild, f]

Although, for some people, their positive reaction to this poster relied on conceptualising the old woman and young girl as ‘innocent’, it caused other people to think hard about what motivates men to sexually assault anyone. For some people, particularly some male participants, the idea that these women weren’t conventionally attractive made the use of the word ‘power’ in the strap line particularly appropriate:

Rather than just a couple of columns in a newspaper you’re actually seeing an old person and a young person and you’re wondering about the sexual attraction of these people [...] It would make somebody wonder perhaps what kind of sexual gratification anybody could get from having intercourse with a 93 year old or a 3 year old, you know, where is the pleasure? Is it a sexual pleasure or is it a power issue when you’ve got to dominate somebody else? [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

It is good because it brought across the point that what you call sexual abuse has got nothing to do with sex at all [...] I don’t think anyone could say ‘I was swept off my feet by a 93 year old. [Grp 1, Office workers, m]

XIV. 2. 2. The strap-line ‘husband, father stranger’:

This strap-line was seen as ‘arresting’ - ‘because it names the people who are closest to you’ [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]. Many participants felt it was very important to identify husbands and fathers as potential abusers, although there was some unease with this strap-line [see section IX. 3.]. Some people wanted to included references to a wider range of acquaintances to take away from the emphasis on close relatives, other research participants wanted to see other relatives such as brothers and sons identified as potential assailants. Including a reference to ‘sons’ in this strap-line would make people think about old women being victims of men known to them rather than reverting to notions of ‘stranger-danger’ when thinking about assaults on 93 year old women. It was very noticeable that the group discussions about the rape of old women tended to focus on women who were victims of burglary and opportunistic rape from strangers. There was very little recognition that women could be the victims of their carers and relatives.
XIV. 3. By the time they reach eighteen ....'

XIV. 3. 1. Detailed responses to the image:

This poster was widely liked. Some people ‘read’ the photograph as an image showing children ‘before’ either had been abused and their happiness has been shattered. When they were shown the picture on its own they suggested captions such as ‘Don’t spoil our innocence’ [Grp 13, Neighbours, f]. Others thought that one of the children had already been abused and they invariably picked the child with the dark hair as the victim. Most of the group participants did not appear to identify this child as black (with the exception of one white police officer and several black respondents). Some noticed very little difference between the two girls at all - seeming only to notice their long hair and similar clothing. Indeed, one respondent commented: ‘It looks like they’re twins’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, f]. The poster is not successful in identifying one of the children as black (at least as far as white viewers, and indeed some black viewers, are concerned). In one group, participants also suggested that it was unfortunate that this was the only poster with any images of black people, especially given the caption about ‘one of them’ being subjected to sexual abuse: ‘because you’re instantly going to wonder which one it’s going to be’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]. This may be particularly problematic given that it was always the ‘dark’ child who was identified as a victim - partly because of how she was sitting, and partly because of the room and ‘whiteness’ of the room and toys surrounding her:

f1: the white girl looks much more relaxed that the other wee girl. [...] I would think it was that wee girl’s house. She seems much more comfortable there than what she does (pointing to the black child). It’s that wee girl’s home.

f2: There’s a white doll in it. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

XIV. 3. 2. Child sexual abuse - does it ‘fit’ as part of a campaign against violence against women?

Several people expressed surprise to see a poster dealing with child sexual abuse as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign. The abuse of children was not always seen as ‘a women’s issue’ or a problem of ‘domestic violence’. In fact focusing on child sexual abuse as a problem for girl-children was seen by some as undermining the ‘dignity’ of the problem:

There is something in the like of wee girlies and their dollies, it’s kind of making abuse a little girlies’ thing. You know, there is something in that that is kind of denying it the dignity it deserves. It is something that happens to people and is perpetrated by people. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

Some research participants could not see how this poster linked with the campaign’s concern about women being battered. As one police officer commented: ‘I was certainly quite surprised when I saw this poster associated to a campaign which I associated with bringing awareness to people about the problems of domestic violence.’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

While, in another group, a woman expressed surprise at this poster: ‘Oh, I thought Zero Tolerance was about something else. I thought it was about violence against women. I didn’t realise it dealt with children as well’. A point to which her colleague responded by saying: ‘Well, they are women, women in the making.’[laughter] [Grp 17, Academics]

It would appear that child sexual abuse, out of all the issues covered by the campaign, is most likely to be seen as a ‘gender-free’ issue. It also seems that the campaign is drawing links (between the abuse of women at all different life-stages) which is surprising to some people.
XIV. 3. 3. The phrase ‘From Flashing to Rape...’: A few people felt that this was an inappropriately broad definition of sexual abuse. As one man commented: ‘What bothered me about that is it could be really severe or what I suppose I would tend to think of as marginal. I’d rather see 1 in 5 could be subjected to really serious abuse’ [Grp 1, Office workers, m]. It certainly seemed that the use of this broad definition could allow people to hide behind the belief that the bulk of the abuse was ‘only flashing’ or to dismiss the statistics in other ways:

*I think it’s maybe one in ten or one in twenty, I can’t see it being 1 in 2. Maybe a father will take a wee lassie in the bath with him and wash her - is that going to be classed as sexual abuse - because she’s seen you naked. You know, from the ridiculous to the sublime!* [Grp 5, Transport workers, f]

One in two, you think “Oh, God!” and then you think “Oh, well, they’re only talking about flashing” [Grp 17, Academics, f].

However, many group participants, particularly some of the women, were very positive about the use of this broad continuum:

*I must say I like the simplicity of it, I do. I think that catch line ‘From flashing to rape is a crime’ - that’s quite strong. [...] I think that’s quite arresting. I think it makes people think about it.* [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f].

*I think it’s important to include the flashing because it doesn’t spring to everyone’s mind as being sexual abuse, you know, the flashers are the people that everyone has a laugh about.* [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]

Interestingly, even if people were unsure that ‘flashing’ should have been included in the strapline, the phrase seemed to open the way for some research participants to talk about their own experiences of abuse. It was very striking that discussion of this strap-line ‘from flashing to rape’ seemed to enable research participants from a wide range of groups to discuss incidents which they had never discussed before with the friends, neighbours or colleagues in that group. Women from various of the ‘general population groups’ described experiences of sexual harassment, battery, rape and incest and often talked about confusing and upsetting incidents they had found hard to define (including, for example, traumatic and coercive experiences of ‘loosing their virginity’). Thus, although the fact that the statistics included everything ‘from flashing to rape’ allows some people to dismiss the statistics as almost meaningless it seems to make other people think about the whole range of abuses experienced throughout a woman’s life and certainly provokes discussion. The phrase also seems to give women (and, in a couple of cases, men) ‘permission’ to talk about what has happened to them. (A factor which other evidence suggests has an important influence on people’s willingness to accept the statistics presented elsewhere in the Zero Tolerance campaign).
XV. WHERE NEXT AND WHAT MORE?

Regardless of whether or not they liked the campaign most participants wanted the campaign to deliver more than they felt that it did. They wanted it to be more widespread, give more information, cover more issues, and to be followed up by more practical resources and changes in legal structures and provisions such as public transport.

XV. 1. More publicity

Firstly, people wanted to see more of the campaign (or a different campaign tackling similar issues). For example, one man queried why the posters along Princes street had been taken down:

*Why have they been taken down, surely they should be up somewhere permanently. […] Can't the council provide a permanent site. I think it should be an on-going thing, 100% of the time. Because the posters have been taken away now are we to understand that the situation has improved or that there is no more violence against women? [Grp 5, Transport workers, m]*

Most importantly, many research participants wanted to see the campaign (or other types of material against violence) taken into schools. There was a widespread belief that any change in society would only be brought about by 'catching them young'. ‘I really think that’s where the crux lies, you have to educate children coming up to change’ [Grp 7, Women's Aid workers, f].

XV. 2. More information

Secondly, most group participants wanted to see more information available. Some wanted the campaign to offer 'answers' or, at least, suggestions for positive action. They wanted to know what they personally could do. Many research participants also wanted phone numbers on the posters, telling women and children who they could contact for help. One group suggested creating a central telephone number that would refer women to the appropriate source of help and distributing a list of women's resource organisations: ‘We could do an A to Z. Like the District Council has produced an A to Z of council services, there could be an A to Z of women's resources […] that could be distributed to every house, that is what they did with the District one.' [Grp 11, Shakti women's group, f]. Another woman wanted to see information on the posters informing women of their rights (in relation to housing, immigration, NHS provisions etc.):

*I would like to see something that informs women of their rights […] that they can go to the police […] That you can get homeless accommodation from the council, and it can be done secretly, you can go to another town even. [Grp 11, Shakti women's group, f]*

Those who had not had access to the leaflets produced as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign (and there were only 2000 printed) criticised the lack of further information:

*I've been on the phone for hours and hours trying to get myself help over the last few years, and almost failed so many times. It's just unbelievable that […] they have this huge campaign […] but there's not real literature, no leaflet, no booklet. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]*
Some people complained that a public awareness campaign without the informational back up was ‘worse than nothing.’ However, others welcomed the campaign as a force to motivate the collation of information and provision of services:

I’ve decided that the campaign was a brilliant idea [precisely] because there didnae seem like any sort of prior reference [...] if we’re starting to have it plastered all over Princes Street, then I am hopeful that people like us, and anybody that is interest, will start to ask questions. [...] Concerned people will start to think ‘Well, where can we find out about this?’ [...] I’m looking on it as a first step. [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

XV. 3. More issues

Some group participants wanted to see messages addressing the problem of the sexual abuse of boys (and other forms of violence against men) and looking at the problem of violence by women. This desire was often, although not invariably, expressed in the form of criticism against the Zero Tolerance campaign and was often allied to the argument that the advertisements were ‘sexist’. Some guys get abused by women, you dinnae hear it but I’ve heard it, a guy getting raped by a wifey before and he’s no spoke up cause he’s embarrassed’ [Grp 4, Youth Group, f]. ‘What about men who have been raped, I mean, society is not really ready to accept that men are raped [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f].

The poster about child sexual abuse was the focus of particular criticism because it did not include a boy in the photograph, some people felt this undermined the message: ‘I felt sad for the male children left out of that [...]. It seems such a great pity that the message was not a whole one. Why are the male children left out?’ [Grp 10, Self-help group, f]

Whether or not people saw it as undermining the validity of the Zero Tolerance campaign there were also many other issues that people wanted to be addressed: ‘I think it’s very good but I would like to see a different poster, you know [about] abuse of another human being, [...] a general human rights one as well.’ [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

However, the Zero Tolerance campaign was not necessarily seen as the best place to address such issue. It was often simply that people welcomed the idea of public awareness campaigns and wanted to see similar publicity covering other social problems. The Zero Tolerance campaign was seen as an important start, and these respondents felt that it was quite right to focus on the particular issue around the nature of violence against women in the home.

The campaign must have a remit, it can’t cover everything. And the remit of violence perpetrated against women by men seems ... if you are interested in something within that remit, here are your statistics. [Grp 1, Office workers, m].

The following debate between members of a group of Rail and Transport workers illustrates some of the different points of view:

m1: It affects males as well, you know, if affects us as well. [...] I suffer from male abuse as well in as much if a big guy in a pub takes a dislike to the way I’ve looked at him or something on a Saturday night he can take me outside and beat me up as well, you know. So if that guy goes home to his wife, after beating me up, and beats her up or what ever, now I’m still suffering the same male abuse of power. [...] f: It doesn’t normally happen at home behind closed doors, that’s the difference.
m2: You’re talking about people out of the home now. But if I ken there’s a guy that’s been throwing his weight about in the pub I can avoid him. I can avoid him. This person here [pointing at picture] that’s stuck in the home and wondering when he’s going to come back, when she’s going to get it. [...] Listening to this discussion, I think [the Zero Tolerance campaign is] on the right tack. Because basically what its all about is the abuse of power in the home [...]. And it does happen behind closed doors and there’s neighbours know it’s happening and still nothing is done. It’s an everyday thing. [Grp 5, Transport workers]

XV. 4. More resources

In addition to information, group participants wanted to see more resources made available to help the victims (and sometimes the perpetrators) of abuse. The Zero Tolerance Campaign was seen as ‘a drop in the ocean’ [Grp 2, residents, f]: ‘Posters and leaflets alone don’t make a campaign, there’s got to be more to it’ [Grp 8, Police Officers, m]; ‘You have got to go beyond that. There has got to be another step’. [Grp 5, Transport workers]

Some workers in agencies concerned with violence and abuse expressed a degree of cynicism about the District Council funding a public awareness campaign without providing the necessary back-up. A woman working for a marriage counselling service commented:

I feel quite angry about it because the Women’s Committee have spent a lot of money on this and yet an organisation like this which has almost no money [...] is dealing with the whole problem, the real problem. We’re trying to help people who’ve been sexually abused cope with it, understand it, deal with their apprehensions that it’s going to be perpetuated, and we’re dealing with it in a much wider way. [...] Giving money to an organisation like this would be a much better use of money. [Grp 3, Marriage Counselling Service workers, f]

Similarly a worker from Women’s Aid, although she applauded the campaign, wanted to see it matched by resources for refuges and she was concerned about possible over-load on existing agencies:

The only qualm I have about the campaign is the fact that [it seemed] that part of the campaign was to increase funding to groups such as ourselves, it seemed like a promise and it hasn’t come yet. That’s really important. [The Zero Tolerance Campaign] advertised this violence and abuse that goes on but it hasn’t made anything available, be it funding or information or anything like that. The campaign to advertise it was very well thought out, I think it was quite good, but it ends there. [Grp 7, Women’s Aid workers, f]

XV. 5. Mobilising change in other areas such as public transport and the law

Attitudes towards, and lack of public awareness about, violence against women was identified as only part of the problem. Even the provision of help-lines and refuge space was not enough. People wanted to see wider changes. Transport policy, for example, was seen as vital to women’s safety. While many people welcomed the Edinburgh ‘safe taxi’ initiative access to, and safety on, public transport was also identified as important (particularly by those groups from working class areas of Edinburgh). One research participant had been made to get off a bus because she had three children under 5 with her
and, in those circumstances, it is Lothian’s policy to charge a fare for one of the children. This could directly endanger women and children by restricting their access to transport.

Group discussion of the campaign also often led to lengthy debates about the action of police and statements by the judiciary. Many people wanted to see reforms in the operation of criminal justice in this area. One woman who had been battered said 'The police do nothing - they just called the ambulance and said 'do you have any witnesses?' and added 'If you're wanting them out of your house the police should do it, because you can't do it without help.' [Grp 2, residents, f] Another described how she had felt compelled to return to her abusive husband in an effort to be able to stay in her own home:

I told her [my lawyer] I was in fear of my life. I didn't want to stay with my husband, she said if you want that house you have to go back in there.[...] I'm sure the reason she sent me back there was hoping that he would hit me and she would have some proof, because there wasn't really anything to go on. It was just horrible. Every night wondering if I was going to wake up alive. I didn't have any rights. [Grp 9, Gingerbread members, f]
XVI. CONCLUSION

The Zero Tolerance campaign has been extremely successful in attracting attention and in gaining a positive reaction from the majority of people who took part in the street survey. Unlike a commercial advertisement any attempt to influence public consciousness must, by definition, attempt to shift existing ways of thinking, rather than simply reinforcing them. For that very reason public awareness interventions often generate controversy. The Zero Tolerance campaign is certainly challenging and is providing people with new information, perspectives and concepts. It has been thought-provoking and has generated debate, and strong feelings were expressed both for and against the campaign. At the same time the statistics from the street survey suggest that it has alienated only a small minority of the population. There is wide-spread public approval for the adoption of such campaigns and the combined evidence of the street survey and the group discussion data suggest that Edinburgh District Council has actually improved it's own image, and the image of the city, in the eyes of many people.

The publicity strategy adopted by the campaign organisers in Edinburgh has been strikingly successful and offers a model for future campaign promotions. At the same time, there are clearly some differences in interpretation of some of the messages, some evasion of the statistical facts provided in the campaign material and some disagreement with the direction of the campaign. There are also some clear gaps and areas where improvements could be made to the campaign material. Supplementary information and public awareness work (perhaps taken into schools), along with the formation of action groups, is necessary in order to build on the success of the campaign. In addition it is seen as vital that any such public awareness intervention be accompanied by, or at the very least generate, an increase in practical provisions to help tackle this issue and that it leads to wider changes to the social, economic and legal framework surrounding violence against women.

******
End Note: Limitations of the study and implications for future research:

The research reflects the emphasis of the Zero Tolerance campaign itself in that, for example, the study focused on residents of Edinburgh city. The research does not therefore address the specific needs of rural populations. In addition, because the project was relatively small-scale and the discussion groups were chosen to provide a broad range of groups, this report does not provide an in-depth exploration of the views of any particular section of the population (such as young people or those from different ethnic minorities). However, some potential concerns of different groups in the population were clearly highlighted in the discussions and further research and consultation could usefully be conducted in order to develop the campaign in ways which address these issues. For example, given the support for taking materials about violence into schools we would recommend development and evaluation work with pupils, teachers and youth workers. Similarly, given the points raised about racism, further research in this area is also clearly needed.

It should also be noted that the timing of the research meant that we were unable to collect data prior to the launch of the campaign and thus were unable to collect any statistics documenting changes in public awareness (although the qualitative data from the focus groups does give access to such information in another way). A tight schedule also meant that we were not able to conduct ‘sandwich research’ whereby the survey questionnaire could have been refined through conducting some focus groups first. Finally, the apparent reluctance of some men to participate in discussion groups about the Zero Tolerance Campaign, meant that men are under-represented in the qualitative data from the discussion groups (which only included 11 men), although they make up almost half (44%) of the street survey respondents. 7 We hope that future research may be able to address some of these issues.

7 Men were consistently less likely to volunteer to participate in the research session. For example, a request for volunteers from a meeting involving about 3 women and 30 men resulted in 2 of the women and but only 3 men agreeing to participate. When we approached a youth group none of the boys were interested in debating the campaign and this resulted in a girls-only session and when we set up another all-male group involving three colleagues, they decided against taking part on the day that the session was due to have taken place.
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XVII. APPENDIX

XVII. 1. Detailed breakdown of survey data

XVII. 1. 2. Characteristics of the sample:

Fifty six percent of respondents were women; respondents were split relatively evenly between the age groups; 58% were in living in owner-occupied accommodation; and 50% were currently employed (see Table 1). Employment status is not considered in any detail in the report since it had a strong and statistically significant association with both age and sex (two variables which are important discriminators of response to many questions within the street survey). Interviews were achieved with a slightly higher proportion of younger respondents (under 30 years) and slightly lower proportion of older respondents than planned, but otherwise the interviewees appear to reflect the age, sex and class composition of Edinburgh (although we have no information about how many people in each category had refused to take part in the Survey before the assigned quotas were achieved). There was no relationship between sex and tenure, or between sex and age. There was, however, a statistically significant relationship between age and tenure: unsurprisingly, the older (50+) respondents were more likely to be owner-occupiers than the younger respondents (p<0.001).

The vast majority of the respondents (83%) were resident in Edinburgh; most of the remainder (11%) lived within 50 miles of the city, and just 5% and 2% lived elsewhere in Scotland or outwith Scotland respectively (see Table 1). Most of those interviewed travelled through Princes St. regularly in the last month: a quarter had travelled through daily, 20% 3 to 6 times a week, and 35% 1-2 times per week. Almost all (96%) of those who had travelled through Princes St at least weekly lived within the City. Only 8% were in Princes St for the first time in the last month; most of these people lived elsewhere in Scotland or outwith Scotland. Thus most of the sample had had ample opportunity to observe the campaign’s placards; and the survey largely canvassed the opinion of a local resident (rather than tourist) population.

XVII. 1. 2. Knowledge and attitudes of the sample:

The sample were asked to express their agreement or otherwise with a number of questions which ascertained how traditional their views were on gender roles, whether they felt that violence against women should be criminalised, and aspects of their knowledge about violence against women. Most of the sample did not hold very traditional views about gender roles; a majority (75%) disagreed with the statement that “Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband should have the main say-so in family matters” (Table 2a). There was a significant tendency for women to more strongly reject very traditional roles than men (see differences in Table 2a for ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘just disagree’), and for older people to hold more traditional views than younger people. No significant differences were seen by tenure. A similar pattern is seen in relation to the statement (from the British Social Attitude Surveys) that “A husband’s job is to earn the money; a wife’s job is to look after the house and family” (see Table 2b).

Over 90% of the sample agreed with the statement that “Men who abuse are criminals and should be treated as such” (Table 2c). Again responses were not significantly related to tenure, but more women than men ‘strongly’ (rather than just) agreed with this statement (p<0.05), and those at younger ages were more likely to strongly agree (p<0.001).
More ambivalent responses were elicited in response to three questions on knowledge about violence: 22% overall neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement “If domestic violence happens once it is more likely to happen again” (see Table 2d); equivalent percentages are 18% and 44% for the statements “Battered women come from all walks of life. Social class, family and racial background make no difference” and “Nearly half of the attacks on women take place in front of observers” respectively (see Tables 2e and 2f). Men were considerably more likely than women to give such an equivocal response for the first and third of these statements.

More women (81%) than men (63%) expressed agreement with the statement “If domestic violence happens once it is more likely to happen again”, and younger people were more likely to strongly agree with this statement (p<0.001); responses were again unrelated to tenure (Table 2d). Women were also more likely (40%) than men (22%) to agree that “Nearly half of the attacks on women take place in front of observers” (Table 2f). Differences between men and women were less marked (and not statistically significant) for the statement “Battered women come from all walks of life. Social class, family and racial background make no difference”; only age was significantly related to these responses with younger groups again expressing higher degrees of knowledge (Table 2e).

XVII. 1. 3. Extent and sources of knowledge about the Campaign:

The campaign seems to have been successful both in its exposure and in the responses it invoked. Sixty four percent of respondents had already seen or heard publicity about the campaign before coming to Princes St on the day of the interview (Table 3a). Statistically significant differences were seen for age and frequency of use of Princes St. As would be expected more frequent travellers through Princes St were more aware of the Campaign than less frequent travellers: 85% of those who had travelled through Princes Street 3 or more times per week over the last month said that they had seen publicity about the Campaign before the day of the interview as compared with 54% of less frequent users of Princes St (p<0.0001). Less than half of the oldest age group (50+ years) had seen publicity, compared with 71% of both of the younger age groups. Although women were somewhat more likely to have heard of the campaign this was not statistically significant.

The 145 respondents who had seen or heard about the campaign before coming to Princes St on the day of the interview were asked where they recalled seeing publicity about the campaign. Posters exhibited outside in public places were by far the most commonly cited sources of information about the campaign, and were recalled by 92%. Press coverage was the next most commonly cited source, and was mentioned by 52%. Posters exhibited elsewhere, leaflets and personal contacts (friends, family, colleagues and so on) were mentioned by 29%, 10% and 10% respectively. Only 3 people mentioned any other sources of information about the campaign.

Interviewees were also asked whether they had talked to anyone about the Zero Tolerance Campaign. Of the 183 people who responded to this question, 39% had talked with someone (Table 3b). As might be expected from earlier responses, it was women (as opposed to men), younger people (as opposed to older), and frequent users of Princes St (as opposed to less frequent users) who were significantly more likely to have talked to others about the campaign; those living in owner-occupied accommodation were no more likely to have talked about the campaign than others.
XVII. 1. 4. The public’s evaluations of the Campaign:

This section covers the central part of this report on the street survey data, namely the public’s response to the Zero Tolerance Campaign. We asked interviewees first to describe how positive or negative they felt about the campaign in general on a five point scale (see Table 4a). Although this enabled us to ask directly about the campaign, this question was only asked of the 145 people who had stated that they had some prior knowledge of the campaign before the day of the interview. In order to elicit some reactions to the campaign from all interviewees, each was asked to say how much they agreed or disagreed with two statements: “The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance Campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image”; and “Edinburgh is right to take a lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse”. Each of these is discussed below in relation to sex, age, tenure and frequency of use of Princes St.

Overall evaluations from the 145 (64%) who said that they had already seen publicity about the campaign were positive. A third (33%) described their feelings about the campaign as ‘very positive’ and a further 46% as ‘quite positive’. Only 5% (7 respondents) described their feelings as ‘quite negative’ and just 2 of these interviewees (1.4%) were ‘very negative’. The remaining 15% were ‘neither positive nor negative’ (Table 4a).

Women were more likely than men to be very positive about the Campaign (44% vs. 17%), and much less likely to be equivocal or negative (p<0.001). Only 2% of these women described their feelings as either ‘quite’ or ‘very negative’, as compared with 12% of men. The differences in responses by age were not statistically significant, although the oldest age group were somewhat less positive overall; even so almost three quarters of the 50+ age group described their feelings as either ‘quite’ or ‘very positive’. Those from owner-occupier households were more likely to give more positive evaluations, and 86% described their feelings as either ‘quite’ or ‘very positive’; those from other households were more likely to be equivocal (23% as compared with 9%). There was no difference in the evaluations given by the more regular users of Princes St than by those less regular users.

Further positive support for the campaign is evidenced in the responses to the two statements. Only 4% (9 respondents) disagreed with the statement that “Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse” (Table 4b), whereas 78% agreed with the statement (32% strongly agreeing, and 46% just agreeing); the remaining 18% neither agreed nor disagreed (and data were missing for just 14 respondents on this question). Significant sex differences were again seen, although they were somewhat less dramatic than for the overall evaluations. Most of the difference between the sexes was accounted for by differences in those who ‘strongly’ agreed with the statement (40% of women and 22% of men) as opposed to those who ‘just’ agreed (39% of women and 55% of men). Perhaps surprisingly in the light of earlier responses, age differences were not sufficiently great to achieve statistical significance. No differences were seen by tenure. However, those who were frequent users of Princes St were more likely to agree (both ‘strongly’ and ‘just’) with the statement than less frequent users who were more equivocal.

Similarly, only a minority (11%) agreed (4% ‘strongly’ and 7% ‘just agree’) with the statement that “The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image” (Table 4c). The majority either strongly disagreed (35%) with the statement or ‘just’ disagreed (31%). Amongst the remainder 22% neither agreed nor disagreed and data were missing for just 16 respondents.
Responses to this question did not vary by the frequency of use of Princes St, but significant differences were seen by sex, age and tenure (Table 4c). Men were nearly twice as likely as women to be equivocal about the statement (30% vs. 16%), and women were more likely than men to express support for the campaign by strongly disagreeing with the statement (43% vs. 26%). Patterns by age essentially mirrored those seen earlier, with the oldest age group expressing less clear support. Still, though, even amongst those age over 50 years only 18% actually agreed that the campaign was bad for Edinburgh’s image. Although nearly half (48%) of the youngest age group strongly disagreed with the statement (as compared with 34% and 19% of the older two age groups respectively), over a quarter of these 15-29 year olds were equivocal and neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

In order to look in more detail at the public’s reaction to Zero Tolerance Campaign, data from the two statements were combined. These combined responses enabled us: to identify those who were most positive and most negative; to check that people who held apparently contradictory views on these questions were relatively few in number; and to look at the opinions of those who were most positive in contrast to those expressing negative feelings about aspects of the campaign. Over 60% (131 interviewees, 62% of the 212 who answered both questions) were labelled as ‘wholly positive’; these were the people who thought that Edinburgh was right to take a lead but rejected the notion that the display of the Zero Tolerance posters in Princes St was bad for Edinburgh’s image (Table 5a).

Just 12% (26 people) were classified as having ‘any negative’ feelings about the Campaign: these were people who did not think that Edinburgh was right to take the lead and/or thought that the display of posters in Princes St was bad for Edinburgh’s image. Just 6 people (out of the 212 who responded to these two questions) expressed negative views on both statements. A further 10 people were negative about one statement and neutral about the other. Nine of these 10 people disagreed with the statement that ‘Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse’ but neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that ‘The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image’. Finally, a further 10 people had apparently contradictory views; they expressed support for the Campaign in response to one question but not the other (one person disagreed with both statements, whereas the remaining 9 agreed with both).

In order to distinguish the most positive and the most negative most clearly, the remainder of the interviewees (26%, i.e. 55 people) were classified as ‘other’ (in Tables 6 and 7) or as having expressed ‘some equivocal feelings’ (Table 5a). This comprised of 20 interviewees who were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) about both statements, and 35 interviewees who were expressed positive support for the campaign in one statement, but were neutral about the other. Most (26/35) supported the campaign by agreeing with the statement that ‘Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse’ but were neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that ‘The display of posters in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance campaign is bad for Edinburgh’s image’.

As expected more women (69%) than men (52%) expressed consistently positive views about the campaign, and fewer women (17%) expressed negative reactions in response to either statement than men (38%) Although there was a tendency for older people to express more negative feelings and fewer consistently positive feelings differences by age were not statistically significant in this case. People living in owner-occupied accommodation were, however, more likely to be wholly positive (69% vs. 53%) and less likely to express
any negative feelings (20% vs. 35%) than people in other tenure groups.

XVII. 1.5. The public’s evaluations of perceived ‘need’ for and acceptability of a campaign around violence:

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they disagreed with two statements which aimed to tap their evaluation of the acceptability of and the perceived ‘need’ for public discussion and information around violence against women.

The first of these statements, “Violence against women is not the sort of issue that should be publicly discussed”, was endorsed by less than 10% of interviewees; 43% disagreed strongly and a further 39% just disagreed (Table 7a). This suggests further support for the campaign in raising the profile of violence against women as an important issue for public debate. As for many of the other statements, significant differences were seen by sex (p<0.01) and age (p<0.001), though not tenure. Women and younger people were more likely to strongly reject the statement. The difference in those who agreed with the statement was much higher (19%) in the oldest age group (50+ years) than in either of the two younger age groups (3% and 4% respectively).

Interviewees were also asked whether they agreed with the statement that “The public as a whole do not know enough about violence and abuse” (Table 7b). Nearly three quarters of the sample (72%) felt this to be true, although quite a high percentage (22%) were uncertain. Significant sex (p<0.01) and age (p>0.001) differences were again seen, but responses did not differ significantly by tenure. Women were more likely to strongly agree (33% vs. 20% for men), and were much less likely to disagree (3% vs. 12% for men). The 15-29 year olds were more likely to strongly agree than their older counterparts (27% and 18% for the 30-49 and 50+ groups respectively). Amongst the oldest age group fully 40% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Responses to both of these statements were also cross tabulated against people’s expressed feelings about the campaign (as described above). Amongst interviewees who had expressed only support for the campaign almost all (97%) disagreed with the statement that “Violence against women is not the sort of issue that should be publicly discussed”, compared with only 22% of those who had expressed at least one negative reaction to the campaign. Nearly half of the latter (43%) agreed with this statement (Table 7a).

The contrast between those who were most positive and those most negative about the campaign also showed through in responses to the question about public ignorance about domestic violence and abuse. Nearly all (93%) of the first (most positive) group thought that the public were not sufficiently well informed about violence and abuse, as compared with just 39% of the most negative. Half of the ‘negative’ group said though that they were neither able to agree or disagree with the statement, and thus only 12% of this group actually disagreed with the statement.
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<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE OF RESIDENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Edinburgh</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 50 miles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Scotland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwith Scotland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FREQUENCY OF VISITS TO PRINCES STREET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 times per week</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times per week</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2a: Extent of Agreement with the Statement "Some Equality in Marriage is a Good Thing, but by and Large the Husband Should Have the Main Say-So in Family Matters"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE %</th>
<th>FEMALE %</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>15-29 %</th>
<th>30-49 %</th>
<th>50+ %</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>OWNER %</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base numbers</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance*: p<0.001  
* Significance calculated combining first 2 responses ('strongly agree', 'just agree') to obtain a valid chi-square value

### Table 2b: Extent of Agreement with the Statement "A Husband's Job is to Earn the Money; A Wife's Job is to Look After the Home and Family"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE %</th>
<th>FEMALE %</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>15-29 %</th>
<th>30-49 %</th>
<th>50+ %</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>OWNER %</th>
<th>OTHER %</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base numbers</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance*: p<0.01  
P<0.001  
* Significance calculated combining first 2 responses ('strongly agree', 'just agree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
### ATTITUDE AND KNOWLEDGE OF SAMPLE - CRIMINALITY OF VIOLENCE

**Table 2c  EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "MEN WHO ABUSE ARE CRIMINALS AND SHOULD BE TREATED AS SUCH"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance* p<0.05  p<0.001  NS

* Significance calculated combining last 3 responses ("neither agree nor disagree", "just disagree", "strongly disagree") to obtain a valid chi-square value

### ATTITUDE AND KNOWLEDGE OF SAMPLE - KNOWLEDGE ABOUT VIOLENCE

**Table 2d  EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "IF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HAPPENS ONCE, IT IS LIKELY TO HAPPEN AGAIN"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance* p<0.01  p<0.001  NS

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ("just disagree", "strongly disagree") to obtain a valid chi-square value, except for age where last 3 responses are combined
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance*</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

Table 3a  PERCENTAGES WHO HAD SEEN OR HEARD PUBLICITY ABOUT THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN BEFORE THE DAY OF INTERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCES ST FREQUENCY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen/heard</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not seen/heard</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Base numbers     | 100% | 126% | 86%   | 68%  | 72% | 130%  | 95%   | 92%           | 116%          | 227%

Significance NS p<0.01 NS p<0.001
# PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

## Table 3b PERCENTAGES WHO HAD TALKED TO ANYONE ABOUT THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL ST FREQUENCY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had talked</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had not talked</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

Table 4a  OVERALL FEELINGS ABOUT THE CAMPAIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCES ST FREQUENCY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite positive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite negative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base numbers</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td><strong>p&lt;0.001</strong></td>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
<td><strong>p&gt;0.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>NS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 3 responses ('neither positive or negative', 'quite negative', 'very negative') to obtain a valid chi-square value
PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

Table 4b EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "EDINBURGH IS RIGHT TO TAKE THE LEAD IN DRAWING ATTENTION TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCES ST FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

Table 4b EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "EDINBURGH IS RIGHT TO TAKE THE LEAD IN DRAWING ATTENTION TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCES ST FREQUENCY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance*</td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value.
PUBLIC RESPONSES TO THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN

Table 4c EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "THE DISPLAY OF POSTERS IN PRINCES STREET AS PART OF THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN IS BAD FOR EDINBURGH'S IMAGE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>PRINCES ST FREQUENCY</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance* p<0.05 p<0.001 p<0.05 NS

* Significance calculated combining first 2 responses ('strongly agree', 'just agree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
Table 5  STRENGTH OF POSITIVE EVALUATION OF THE CAMPAIGN:

COMBINED RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENTS "EDINBURGH IS RIGHT TO TAKE THE LEAD IN DRAWING ATTENTION TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE" AND "THE DISPLAY OF POSTERS IN PRINCES STREET AS PART OF THE ZERO TOLERANCE CAMPAIGN IS BAD FOR EDINBURGH'S IMAGE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly positive about Campaign(a)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any negative feelings about the Campaign(b)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some equivocal feelings about Campaign(c)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance*</td>
<td>P&lt;0.01</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Thought that Edinburgh right to take lead, and did not think that Campaign bad for Edinburgh's image.

\(b\) Either disagreed with statement that 'Edinburgh is right to take the lead in drawing attention to domestic violence and abuse' and/or agreed with statement that 'The display of poster in Princes St as part of the Zero Tolerance Campaign is bad for Edinburgh's image.

\(c\) Either neutral ('neither agree nor disagree') about both statements, or positive about one and neutral about other
### PUBLIC RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS USED WITHIN CAMPAIGN

**Table 6a. EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "85% OF RAPISTS ARE MEN KNOWN TO THEIR VICTIMS"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>FEELINGS RE. CAMPAIGN</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value*
## PUBLIC RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS USED WITHIN CAMPAIGN

**Table 6b EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "ALMOST 50% OF WOMEN MURDERED ARE KILLED BY A PARTNER OR EX-PARTNER"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>FEELINGS RE. CAMPAIGN</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base numbers</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance</strong></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO VIOLENCE

Table 7a EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN IS NOT THE SORT OF ISSUE THAT SHOULD BE PUBLICLY DISCUSSED"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>FEELINGS RE. CAMPAIGN</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>WHOLLY POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base numbers**: 93 | 120 | 83 | 63 | 67 | 122 | 90 | 131 | 26 | 55 | 214

**Significance**

- SEX: **p<0.01**
- AGE: **p<0.001**
- TENURE: NS
- FEELINGS RE. CAMPAIGN: **p<0.001**

* Significance calculated combining first 2 responses ('strongly agree', 'just agree') to obtain a valid chi-square value
PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO VIOLENCE

Table 7b EXTENT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE STATEMENT "THE PUBLIC AS A WHOLE DO NOT KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ABUSE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>FEELINGS RE.</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>15-29</td>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base numbers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance*</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance calculated combining last 2 responses ('just disagree', 'strongly disagree') to obtain a valid chi-square value.