

Routine Arming Survey 2017 Cleveland April 2018

Authors: Nicola Chandler

Security classification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not protectively marked	May be published openly / immediately
	<input type="checkbox"/> Protected	Review whether broader publication
	<input type="checkbox"/> Restricted	Not for open publication. Restricted to:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential	

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of responses to the PFEW routine arming survey received from respondents in Cleveland.

The PFEW routine arming survey was open between 31st July and 1st September 2017. The survey asked respondents about their experiences and attitudes in the following areas:

- Satisfaction with their current access to armed support
- Views on routine arming
- Views on other protective measures and equipment
- The number of times respondents had felt their life had been threatened at work in the last two years

Where appropriate, details of average responses for the police service as a whole are also presented, differences between the national and local responses have not been tested statistically and therefore any differences reported are for guidance only and must be treated with caution.

RESPONSE RATE AND RESPONDENTS

358 responses were received from respondents in Cleveland. This reflects a response rate of approximately 28%, based on Home Office figures from 2017. This compares to a national response rate of 27% of federated rank members.

The findings presented in this report have a margin of error of 5%. This margin of error has been calculated using the number of responses received from officers in Cleveland compared to the number of officers in the force as a whole. A margin of error of 5% or less is generally considered to be within the normal bounds of academic rigor. If this threshold has not been met, the results from this report must be interpreted more cautiously.

84% of responses from Cleveland were received from male officers and 16% of responses were from female officers. 75% of respondents were Constables, 18% were Sergeants and 6% were Inspectors or Chief Inspectors.

62% of respondents said that they were in a frontline role.

SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT ARMED SUPPORT

Of those respondents who had a view, 30% within Cleveland said that they were either very or fairly satisfied that armed support would be readily available should they require it. In comparison, 70% were either not very or not at all satisfied that armed support would be available.

Nationally, 43% of respondents were either very or fairly satisfied that armed support would be readily available should they require it.

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied
How satisfied are you that armed support is readily available should you require it?	4%	26%	39%	30%

VIEWS ON ROUTINE ARMING

43% of respondents within Cleveland said that they were in favour of routine arming, insofar as they felt all officers should receive appropriate training and be armed at all times when on duty. This compares to 34% of respondents across England and Wales as a whole.

All police officers should receive appropriate training and be armed at all times when on duty	All police officers should receive appropriate training and firearms should be issued to them as and when necessary	Firearms should not be issued to all police officers, but more officers should receive appropriate training and be issue	The present number of officers who are specially trained to carry firearms is about right
43%	17%	35%	6%

59% of respondents within Cleveland said that they would be prepared to be routinely armed whilst on duty. Nationally, this proportion was 55%. 9% of respondents within

Cleveland, said that they would not carry a firearm whilst on duty under any circumstances, compared to 11% of respondents in England and Wales as a whole.

I would be prepared to carry a firearm at all times on duty	I would be prepared to carry a firearm whilst on duty if necessary	I would be prepared to carry a firearm whilst on duty if ordered to do so	Under no circumstances would I carry a firearm whilst on duty
59%	19%	13%	9%

VIEWS ON OTHER PROTECTIVE MEASURES AND EQUIPMENT

5% of respondents in Cleveland (for whom it is applicable to their role), said that they currently had access to double crewing at all times whilst on duty; 70%, said that they wanted access to double crewing at all times whilst on duty.

The proportion of respondents in Cleveland who said that they have access to double crewing at all times on duty is lower than the national figure, where 11% of respondents have access to double crewing.

21% of respondents in Cleveland (for whom it is applicable to their role), had access to Taser at all times whilst on duty; in comparison 81% said that they wanted to have access to Taser at all times whilst on duty.

The proportion of respondents in Cleveland who have access to Taser at all times whilst on duty is lower than the proportion of respondents in England and Wales who had access to Taser at all time, which was 22%.

33% of respondents in Cleveland (for whom it is applicable to their role), currently had access to Body Worn Video at all times whilst on duty; 76% wanted access to Body Worn Video at all times.

The proportion of respondents in Cleveland who have access to Body Worn Video at all times whilst on duty is lower than in England and Wales as a whole; nationally 55% of respondents reported having access to Body Worn Video at all times whilst on duty.

Officers regularly have access to (for whom its applicable to their role):	Double crewing	Body Worn Video	Taser
Never	11%	34%	65%
When deemed necessary by an officer with appropriate authority	21%	2%	2%
Upon my request whilst I am on duty	3%	6%	4%
At all times whilst I am on duty	5%	33%	21%

THREATS TO LIFE

57% of respondents in Cleveland said that they had felt that their life was in serious danger at least once in the last two years as a result of a threat by a member the public whilst on duty. This is higher than the 54% of respondents within England and Wales as a whole who felt that their life had been in serious danger in the last two years.

A more detailed breakdown of the number of times respondents in Cleveland felt that their life had been in serious danger in the last two years is provided below.

	None	One	Two	Three to four	Five to six	Seven or more
How many times in the last two years have you felt that your life was in serious danger as a result of a threat by a member of the public, whilst on duty?	43%	13%	15%	11%	9%	8%

NOTE TO JBBS

JBBs wishing to obtain further information or additional data from this survey can contact the Research and Policy Support department (fran.boag-munroe@polfed.org) to discuss their requirements. The Research and Policy Department only has one member of staff responsible for these data requests therefore please bear this in mind in terms of turnaround times and the amount of data you request.

All other interested parties should speak to their local JBB in the first instance.