

Routine Arming Survey 2017 Headline Report 14 September 2017

Author: Dr Denis van Mechelen

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	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential	

Summary points

- 34% of all Federated Rank officers responding to the survey are in favour of officers being routinely armed both on or off duty, or just on duty. This is an increase from 23% at the time of the last PFEW Arming Survey in 2006.
- However, two-thirds of all officers do not support the routine arming of all officers.
- The most mentioned response as in 2006 was that firearms should not be issued to all officers, but more officers should receive appropriate training and be issued with firearms, as and when necessary (43%).
- As in 2006 Constables are more likely than higher ranks to support routine arming (37%).
- Also as in 2006 male officers are far more likely to support routine arming (41%) than female officers (16%).
- Younger officers (18-24) are also slightly more likely to support routine arming (39%) than older officers (55+) (32%). Likewise those officers shorter in service (2 years or less) support routine arming (40%) than those longer in service (15 years or more) (35%).
- Officers in inner city (42%) and urban areas (38%) are more likely to support routine arming than officers in other types of area, and especially office based officers (25%).
- Officers in Roads Policing (48%), National Policing roles (47%) and Response (42%) are also more likely to support the routine arming of officers.
- Finally, officers who have experienced most threats to their life in the last 2 years (7 or more times) are more likely to support routine arming (62%) than those with no experiences (25%).

Introduction

- The Routine Arming survey was sent to all federated rank officers on the 31st July 2017. Since the last PFEW survey on this matter was 11 years ago, it was decided to revisit Federation policy in this area in the light of increased assaults on officers, increased gun and knife crime and increased level of terrorist threats in recent years. The main survey questions on the routine

arming of police officers repeated the question wording used in previous PFEW surveys of members on this issue in 1995, 2003 and 2006.¹

- The total number of usable responses was 32,366, which represents 27% of all federated rank officers. Statistically, this sample size is large enough that percentages quoted can be considered to be accurate within the normal bounds of academic rigor.²
- It should be noted that the context for the current survey was somewhat different from that in 2006. Although the previous year, 2005, had seen the 7/7 atrocity in central London, one of the worse mainland UK terrorist attacks in history, the following period was relatively peaceful when the survey took place 9 months later.
- The current survey took place in the context of three fairly recent terrorist attacks by ISIS followers on Westminster Bridge (22 March 2017), on the Manchester Arena (22 May 2017), on London Bridge (3 June 2017) and a further terrorist related incident at the Finsbury Park mosque (19 June 2017). Furthermore, during the survey fieldwork there was a further terrorist related incident in The Mall when unarmed officers were confronted in front of Buckingham Palace by a man with a knife who drove his car towards the

¹ These surveys were undertaken on behalf of PFEW by ERS Market Research. The main questions were worded as follows:

Which of the following options comes closest to your view on the issue and use of firearms?

- *All police officers should receive appropriate training and be armed at all times, either on or off duty*
- *All police officers should receive appropriate training and be armed on duty but not off 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 issued with firearms, as and when necessary*
- *The present number of officers who are specially trained to carry firearms is about right*
- *No view.*

If a decision was made that all police officers should be suitably trained and armed whilst on duty (and possibly off duty), which of the options below comes closest to your view on the routine arming of police officers?

- *I would be prepared to carry a firearm at all times*
- *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*
- *No view*

² (Margin of error well below 2% at 95% confidence level (academic standards are 5% margin of error, with lower being better, and 95% confidence level).

officers (25 August 2017). Also there have been at least 5 foiled attacks between May and July alone. It's also fair to say that unlike in the past it seems that police officers may themselves become the target of such attacks.

- Therefore, it should be borne in mind that the survey responses might possibly be influenced by this new context. It is also worth pointing out that the MetFed survey on arming took place in January this year before these events, which may also have impinged on their results.³ Although it is worth pointing out that the results of the MetFed survey are also not comparable with the current survey since the main arming question and options were worded differently.⁴
- Table 1 reports the demographic composition of the sample. Comparing this with the most recent Home Office data suggests that the sample is very representative of all Federated Rank officers.⁵

Table 1: Demographic composition of 2017 survey compared with Home Office figures (rounded figures)

Rank	Survey	Home Office	Age	Survey	Home Office	Length of Service	Survey	Home Office
Constable	77%	79%	18-34	27%	26%	Under 5 years	16%	18%
Sergeant	17%	15%	35-54	71%	72%	5-10 years*	13%	16%
Inspecting ranks	6%	6%	55+	2%	2%	10 years+	71%	67%

Ethnicity	Survey	Home Office	Gender	Survey	Home Office
White	96%	94%	Male	80%	71%
Non-white	4%	6%	Female	20%	29%

³ Metropolitan Police Federation, *JEC Circular Number: 09-17*, 13 February 2017.

⁴ To illustrate the impact of varying question wording the MetFed reported a figure of 27.4% supporting routine arming, but this figure was actually less than the 40% of Met officers supporting this position in the 2006 PFEW survey.

⁵ Demographic breakdowns for rank, length of service, ethnicity, gender and role based on Home Office figures (*Police Workforce, England and Wales*, Statistical Bulletin, March 2017 and accompanying data tables) <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-england-and-wales-31-march-2017>; Age breakdown based on unpublished *Workforce Census 2016-17 Supplementary tables Main Set* (Home Office).

Role	Survey	Home Office
Neighbourhood Policing*	12%	19%
Response*	37%	32%
Central Communications Unit	1%	2%
Custody	2%	2%
Criminal Justice	1%	0.4%
Roads Policing	6%	5%
Operational support	8%	8%
Intelligence	5%	5%
Investigations	23%	19%
Investigative support	1%	0.3%
National Policing**	1%	6%
Training	2%	2%
Administrative support	1%	0.2%

*Percentages based on these selected roles only. *These roles are often interchangeable these days. Together they total 49% in the survey and 51% on Home Office figures.*

*** The slight under-representation of National Policing may be due to such officers providing a more specific role within this generic role.*

2017 findings compared to 2006

- In reporting the current responses to the main arming question in 2017 we will also make reference to corresponding findings in the last arming survey in 2006.⁶
- Although female officers were slightly under-represented in the survey, we have not attempted to weight the tables to take account of this. However, in the comparative table below on arming views we have included the weighted figures, even though there is only a slight difference from the unweighted figures, so as to better compare with the 2006 survey which was more representative of female officers.
- Table 2 reports the overall responses to the arming question compared to when the exact same question was asked in 2006.

⁶ ERS Market Research, *Police Federation of England and Wales 2006 – Full Report*, April 2006.

Table 2: Views on the issue and use of firearms, 2017 and 2006*

	2006		2017**	
Routinely armed on or off duty	4.9%	} 23.4%	8.9%	} 34.1%
Routinely armed on duty	18.5%		25.2%	
Available to all as and when needed	13.7%		16.8%	
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	47.3%		42.5%	
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	14.8%		6.2%	
No view	0.9%		0.5%	
N***	47,197		32,366	

* For precise wording of options see previous footnote 1;

** Figures weighted for females by 1.450 and for males by 0.8875 (those answering 'In another way' or not answering the gender question were given a weighting of 1). The unweighted figure in support of routine arming is very similar at 36.3%;

*** Note: There were substantially more police officers at the time of the 2006 survey.

- There would appear to have been a sizeable increase in support for routine arming of officers from about a quarter in 2006 to about one-third now. As might be expected with the reduction in specialist firearms officers in recent years there has been a noticeable reduction in those saying that the present number of officers who are specially trained to carry firearms is about right (from 15% to 6%).
- The other figures are not so dissimilar with the modal (most common) response being that firearms should not be issued to all police officers, but that more officers should receive appropriate training and be issued with firearms, as and when necessary (43% now and 47% in 2006). Likewise 17% now and 14% in 2006 supported the idea of all police officers receiving appropriate training but only issued with firearms as and when necessary (so not routinely).
- Therefore, despite the increase in support for routine arming, overall two-thirds of officers do not want to see the routine arming of all officers.

Demographic breakdown of views on the issue and use of firearms

- Table 3 reports responses to the main arming question by rank. As in 2006 there is a noticeable difference between the ranks' support for routine arming. Constables (37%) are far more likely to support routine arming than higher ranks such as Chief Inspectors (23%). This repeats the pattern in 2006 when 25% of Constables supported arming but only 10% of Chief Inspectors did so.

- Higher ranks are also more likely to feel the current number of specially trained firearms officers is about right (15%) compared to only 6% of Constables. Likewise they are more likely than Constables (50% vs. 39%) to say that firearms should not be issued to all, but more officers should receive training and be issued with firearms as and when necessary

Table 3: Views on the issue and use of firearms by Rank*

	Constable (N=24,859)	Sergeant (N=5,511)	Inspectors (N=1,597)	Chief Inspectors (N=359)
Routinely armed on or off duty	10.0%	9.1%	8.6%	5.6%
Routinely armed on duty	27.1%	26.0%	22.8%	17.8%
Available to all as and when needed	17.6%	15.4%	13.5%	11.1%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	39.1%	42.3%	45.2%	50.4%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	5.6%	6.9%	9.5%	14.5%
No view	0.5%	0.3%	0.5%	0.6%

*Unweighted table. * For precise wording of options see previous footnote 1.
p-value < 0.001*

- In respect of gender there are some very noticeable differences in male and female officers' responses. Whereas 41% of male officers support the routine arming of officers, only 16% of female officers do so. Furthermore, an overwhelming majority of female officers support the view that *more* officers should be issued with firearms as and when necessary (61%) compared with only 35% of male officers. However, once again this pattern was repeated in 2006 when 27% of male officers supported routine arming compared with 10% of female officers; and 43% of male officers supported *more* officers having access to arming compared to 62% of female officers.

Table 4: Views on the issue and use of firearms by gender

	Male (N=25,781)	Female (N=6,215)
Routinely armed on or off duty	11.5%	2.1%
Routinely armed on duty	29.6%	14.3%
Available to all as and when needed	17.7%	14.3%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	35.0%	61.2%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	5.6%	7.7%
No view	0.5%	0.4%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- There are also differences in respect of the routine arming of officers by age with younger officers more likely than older officers to express this view. Whereas 39% of 18-24 year olds support routine arming this falls to 32% among officers aged 55 or over. Again this difference is balanced by more older officer wanting more officers to have access to firearms as and when necessary (41%) compared to younger officers (34%). Again the pattern is similar to 2006 when 32% of 18-24 year olds supported routine arming compared to 23% of those 55 and over.

Table 5: Views on the issue and use of firearms by age

	18-24 (N=963)	25-34 (N=7,816)	35-44 (N=12,511)	45-54 (N=10,361)	55+ (N=643)
Routinely armed on or off duty	12.3%	10.5%	9.9%	8.8%	7.2%
Routinely armed on duty	26.8%	28.8%	26.9%	24.8%	24.6%
Available to all as and when needed	24.4%	20.3%	16.8%	14.1%	13.8%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	33.5%	36.6%	39.6%	44.0%	41.4%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	2.9%	3.5%	6.2%	7.7%	12.6%
No view	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- Table 6 shows there is also a difference between officers' views by length of service, but not as marked as by age. Those shorter in service are more likely to support the routine arming of officers compared with those longer in service. About 40% of those with 2 years' service or less support routine arming compared with 35% of those with 15 years or more service. There was a similar gap between those shorter and longer in service supporting routine arming in 2006. Then 25% of officers with 2 years' service or less favoured routine arming compared to 20% of officers with 15 years or more service.

Table 6: Views on the issue and use of firearms by length of service

	Less than 1 year (N=924)	1-2 years (N=1,543)	3-4 years (N=2,519)	5-9 years (N=4,265)	10-14 years (N=7,834)	15 years or more (N=15,258)
Routinely armed on or off duty	9.8%	9.2%	11.9%	10.0%	9.8%	9.3%
Routinely armed on duty	30.2%	30.5%	29.9%	28.1%	26.1%	25.4%
Available to all as and when needed	22.3%	22.6%	22.7%	19.3%	17.4%	14.2%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	34.7%	35.4%	32.8%	37.5%	40.3%	42.8%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	2.8%	2.3%	2.6%	4.9%	6.0%	7.6%
No view	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- There is also variation in arming views depending upon the type of area where officers most regularly work.
- The most significant difference in support for routine arming is between those in inner city locations (42%) and those primarily office based (25%). The latter are more likely to want firearms available to more officers as and when needed but not to all officers (52%). This follows the same pattern as in the 2006 survey. Officers based in rural locations are also least likely to support routine arming than those based in more urban locations. However, the differences are not quite so marked as in 2006, which may have something to do with the more recent increase in single-crewing (see below).

Table 7: Views on the issue and use of firearms by type of Area

	Inner city (N=8,877)	Urban (N=9,628)	Rural town (N=3,828)	Rural (N=712)	Airport and ports (N=161)	Primarily office based (N=4,811)
Routinely armed on or off duty	12.6%	9.5%	7.4%	9.7%	9.3%	7.4%
Routinely armed on duty	28.9%	28.8%	26.6%	28.9%	26.1%	17.2%
Available to all as and when needed	17.9%	17.3%	17.9%	16.2%	16.1%	15.2%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	34.6%	38.4%	41.8%	39.7%	42.2%	51.7%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%	4.8%	5.6%	7.9%
No view	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- Tables 8 compares the views of those officers who are currently Authorised Firearms Officers (AFOs) with those who are not. In 2006 there was little difference between the views of these officers with 21% of AFOs supporting routine arming compared with 24% of all other officers. Now there appears to be a greater disparity of views with 22% of AFOs supporting routine arming (close to the 2006 figure), but a far greater number of non-AFOs supporting this view (37%). However, as in 2006 more AFOs support the view that those specially trained to carry firearms are adequate (17%) or that more officers but not all should have access to firearms (55%) compared to non-AFOs (6% and 39% respectively).

Table 8: Views on the issue and use of firearms by whether or not an Authorised Firearms Officer

	AFOs (N=1,704)	Non-AFOs (N=30,588)
Routinely armed on or off duty	10.4%	9.7%
Routinely armed on duty	11.2%	27.5%
Available to all as and when needed	5.6%	17.6%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	54.8%	39.3%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	17.4%	5.5%
No view	0.8%	0.4%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- Table 9 reports responses by other policing roles. Although not all these categories are compatible with roles recorded in 2006, it is still possible to compare responses for some roles.
- In the current survey those officer roles most in favour of the routine arming of officers were Roads Policing (48%), National Policing roles (47%) and Response (42%). This was also reflected in the 2006 survey where those most in favour of routine arming were in Roads Policing (29%) and Patrol (28%) (in 2006 National Policing was not identified as a role). Officers in Custody (39%), Neighbourhood Policing (36%), Communications (36%) and Intelligence (35%) were also more likely to take this view in 2017. The roles least in favour of routine arming in the current survey were Criminal Justice (27%) and Administrative support (23%).

Table 9: Views on the issue and use of firearms by officers' main role

	N	Routinely armed on or off duty	Routinely armed on duty	Available to all as and when needed	Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	No view
Neighbourhood Policing	3,559	9.3%	26.9%	18.2%	39.4%	6.0%	0.3%
Response	11,209	9.2%	32.6%	19.4%	34.4%	4.1%	0.2%
Central Communications Unit	289	12.1%	24.2%	14.2%	41.9%	7.6%	0.0%
Custody	670	12.1%	26.4%	13.0%	40.0%	8.2%	0.3%
Criminal Justice	184	9.2%	17.4%	13.6%	51.6%	7.6%	0.5%
Roads Policing	1,711	11.8%	35.8%	13.9%	34.0%	4.3%	0.3%
Operational support	2,409	9.9%	23.2%	13.6%	44.1%	8.6%	0.6%
Intelligence	1,529	12.9%	21.8%	15.9%	42.1%	6.7%	0.6%
Investigations	6,931	9.1%	20.0%	16.9%	46.2%	7.3%	0.6%
Investigative support	326	9.5%	21.2%	19.0%	39.9%	9.5%	0.9%
National Policing	221	18.1%	28.5%	15.8%	33.0%	4.1%	0.5%
Training	633	10.1%	19.6%	11.2%	51.2%	7.4%	0.5%
Administrative support	233	6.0%	16.7%	11.6%	56.2%	8.2%	1.3%

*Unweighted table.
p-value < 0.001*

- The following two tables report responses in respect of officers' operational environment. Table 10 shows how officers' views on arming may be influenced by their own personal experience of feeling their life had been in serious danger as a result of a threat by a member of the public (whilst on duty) in the last two years.
- Although the 2006 report did not specifically look at this aspect, it did report the number of times officers had felt their life threatened. Comparing the 2006 responses with those in the current study suggests that there has been an increase in the number of officers experiencing at least one threat to their life in the last two years – from 42% in 2006 to 54% now. Furthermore the number of reported incidents in excess of 3 has increased from 14% in 2006 to 25% now.

- It would seem that those officers who have experienced the most number of threatening situations in the last 2 years are also the ones most likely to support the routine arming of officers. Support for routine arming increases from 25% among those reporting no incidents to 62% among those saying they have felt threatened 7 or more times in the last 2 years. Furthermore support for routine arming progressively increases the more officers have been exposed to such threats: 36% among those reporting one experience, 42% reporting two, 50% reporting three or four, and 56% reporting five or six.

Table 10: Views on the issue and use of firearms by the number of times officers have felt their life was in serious danger

	None (N=14,708)	Once (N=4,378)	Twice (N=5,139)	Three or four times (N=4,177)	Five or six times (N=2,007)	Seven or more times (N=1,801)
Routinely armed on or off duty	6.3%	9.7%	10.2%	13.0%	16.3%	21.9%
Routinely armed on duty	18.5%	26.5%	32.1%	36.5%	39.4%	40.4%
Available to all as and when needed	15.2%	18.9%	20.3%	18.9%	15.9%	14.4%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	50.4%	39.2%	33.5%	28.2%	25.2%	20.8%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	9.0%	5.3%	3.6%	3.0%	2.7%	2.3%
No view	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%

Unweighted table.

p-value < 0.001

- Another operational aspect which can influence officers' views is the extent of single-crewing. Over 70% of officers saying they are in a frontline role are 'often' or 'always' single-crewed.
- Support for the routine arming of all officers increases from 30% among officers saying they are 'never' single-crewed to 45% among who are 'always' single-crewed. Likewise the percentage supporting the arming of *more* officers as and when necessary falls from 44% among those 'never' single-crewed to 33% of those 'always' single-crewed.

Table 11: Views on the issue and use of firearms by frequency of single-crewing among frontline officers

	Never (N=1,514)	Rarely (N=1,967)	Sometimes (N=3,190)	Often (N=11,256)	Always (N=5,217)
Routinely armed on or off duty	10.5%	8.6%	11.5%	9.8%	11.5%
Routinely armed on duty	19.7%	24.1%	27.8%	31.2%	33.9%
Available to all as and when needed	14.9%	18.5%	19.0%	18.7%	16.0%
Not available to all, but to more as and when needed	43.9%	41.8%	36.3%	35.7%	33.2%
As now to those specially trained to carry firearms	11.2%	6.4%	5.1%	4.4%	5.0%
No view	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%

*Unweighted table.
p-value < 0.001*

- Table 12 reports responses to the routine arming question by force. It shows that as one might expect officers in metropolitan forces appear to be most in favour of routine arming of officers. On the other hand, officers in shire forces with more of a mix of rural and rural towns tend to be less in favour of routine arming. However, it should still be emphasised that no force area shows a majority of officers in favour of this option. Interestingly a number of the forces where officers express strong support in favour of routine arming were also prominent supporters of this option in the 2006 survey – most notably the City of London, the Metropolitan Police Service, Greater Manchester, Northumbria, West Midlands and South Wales.

Table 12: Views on the issue and use of firearms by Force area⁷

	Routinely armed on or off duty	Routinely armed on duty	All trained but only available as and when necessary	Not available to all, but more trained and issued as and when necessary	Present number specially trained to carry firearms is about right	No view	All routinely armed either on or off duty, or on duty	N
Northumbria	9.0%	35.8%	14.5%	30.5%	10.0%	0.3%	44.8%	793
Greater Manchester Police	10.8%	33.3%	16.1%	34.0%	5.0%	0.7%	44.1%	1387
Cleveland	8.8%	33.5%	17.1%	34.4%	5.6%	0.6%	42.3%	340
West Midlands	12.5%	29.4%	17.7%	34.2%	5.9%	0.2%	41.9%	2070
City of London	17.6%	24.1%	14.1%	36.5%	7.1%	0.6%	41.7%	170
Nottinghamshire	8.2%	33.4%	16.5%	38.1%	3.5%	0.2%	41.6%	425
Essex	12.8%	28.6%	20.9%	33.0%	4.7%	0.0%	41.4%	790
Durham	7.0%	33.5%	12.5%	44.5%	2.5%	0.0%	40.5%	200
Gwent	8.3%	31.7%	17.4%	38.7%	3.5%	0.4%	40.0%	230
Merseyside	11.4%	28.6%	14.7%	40.9%	4.1%	0.3%	40.0%	1048
Metropolitan Police Service	14.7%	25.1%	18.7%	35.2%	5.8%	0.4%	39.8%	5963
Surrey	11.7%	28.0%	14.0%	39.7%	6.4%	0.2%	39.7%	486
South Wales	9.1%	30.1%	18.5%	39.1%	3.1%	0.2%	39.2%	585
Hertfordshire	8.6%	29.0%	17.2%	40.3%	4.7%	0.2%	37.6%	534
Staffordshire	6.9%	30.2%	13.7%	41.6%	7.4%	0.2%	37.1%	539
Derbyshire	8.8%	28.1%	15.6%	41.7%	5.7%	0.2%	36.9%	456
Bedfordshire	9.7%	26.3%	13.3%	42.3%	8.2%	0.3%	36.0%	331
Warwickshire	9.0%	26.2%	14.8%	45.5%	3.4%	1.0%	35.2%	290
Kent	8.2%	26.9%	17.0%	42.4%	5.0%	0.4%	35.1%	934
Sussex	8.6%	26.4%	17.0%	40.8%	7.0%	0.2%	35.0%	952
Leicestershire	8.5%	26.2%	15.8%	42.8%	5.6%	1.1%	34.7%	645
South Yorkshire	6.7%	28.0%	18.0%	41.5%	5.3%	0.5%	34.7%	600
North Wales	9.4%	24.9%	16.7%	44.1%	4.6%	0.2%	34.3%	413
Suffolk	8.8%	25.4%	15.6%	45.2%	4.6%	0.4%	34.2%	456
Norfolk	7.5%	26.6%	19.1%	40.2%	6.5%	0.0%	34.1%	398
Thames Valley Police	6.7%	26.7%	14.8%	42.8%	8.5%	0.6%	33.4%	1195
Cheshire	7.0%	26.1%	17.3%	41.1%	8.0%	0.5%	33.1%	440
Cambridgeshire	6.8%	25.4%	16.9%	44.8%	4.9%	1.3%	32.2%	473
Dorset	9.3%	22.7%	17.3%	43.6%	7.1%	0.0%	32.0%	353
West Yorkshire	7.9%	24.0%	16.5%	44.4%	6.8%	0.4%	31.9%	747
Wiltshire	8.2%	23.7%	15.5%	44.8%	7.0%	0.8%	31.9%	355
Northamptonshire	10.8%	21.0%	13.8%	47.7%	6.6%	0.0%	31.8%	333
Humberside	6.7%	24.9%	18.2%	46.1%	3.9%	0.2%	31.6%	510
Gloucestershire	7.9%	23.6%	16.9%	44.1%	7.1%	0.4%	31.5%	254

⁷ For most forces the margin of error is well below the academic standards of 5%, with lower being better, and at 95% confidence level. However, the responses from four forces - the City of London, Gloucestershire, Gwent and North Yorkshire - were just below this required level, and that from Cumbria with only 62 responses was well below the level required for statistical robustness. The Cumbria force had problems with their internal communications channels which prevent officers accessing the survey.

Table 12/ cont.

	Routinely armed on or off duty	Routinely armed on duty	All trained but only available as and when necessary	Not available to all, but more trained and issued as and when necessary	Present number specially trained to carry firearms is about right	No view	All routinely armed either on or off duty, or on duty	N
West Mercia	8.0%	23.4%	13.6%	47.1%	6.9%	1.0%	31.4%	624
Lancashire	6.7%	23.3%	16.4%	46.1%	6.7%	0.8%	30.0%	954
Hampshire	5.2%	24.2%	18.0%	43.5%	8.9%	0.2%	29.4%	978
Dyfed-Powys	6.2%	23.1%	18.7%	46.0%	5.5%	0.5%	29.3%	546
Devon and Cornwall	6.5%	22.4%	17.7%	45.7%	6.8%	0.9%	28.9%	1280
Avon and Somerset	7.0%	21.3%	17.3%	46.9%	7.2%	0.4%	28.3%	990
North Yorkshire	5.5%	22.4%	14.2%	48.4%	9.1%	0.4%	27.9%	254
Lincolnshire	3.2%	20.9%	17.4%	51.6%	5.9%	1.1%	24.1%	374
Cumbria*	6.9%	32.8%	1.7%	55.2%	3.4%	0.0%	39.7%	58

Unweighted table.

p-value = 0.001

**Note: Since the response from Cumbria in particular is not statistically robust it has not been included in ordering based on % support for routine arming.*

- We also report responses to the question asking officers what their view would be if a decision was made that all police officers should be suitably trained and armed whilst on or off duty.
- Since 2006 there would appear to have been an increase in officers prepared to carry a firearm in these circumstances, either on or off duty. In the current survey 55% would now be prepared to carry a firearm on or off duty compared to 45% in 2006. A further 21% would be prepared to carry a firearm on duty if necessary (25% in 2006), and 12% would carry a firearm on duty but only if ordered to do so (16% in 2006). Finally, there has been a slight reduction since 2006 in the percentage of officers saying that under no circumstances would they carry a firearm whilst on duty. In the current survey 11% express this view compared to 14% in 2006.

Table 13: Views on the routine arming of officers if it was decided all officers should be armed on or off duty, 2017 and 2006*

	2006		2017**	
Prepared to carry a firearm at all times	18.0%	} 44.6%	27.2%	} 55.2%
Prepared to carry a firearm at all times on duty	26.6%		28.0%	
Prepared to carry a firearm whilst on duty if necessary	25.4%		21.3%	
Prepared to carry a firearm whilst on duty if ordered to do so	15.5%		12.1%	
Under no circumstances would carry a firearm whilst on duty	13.8%		10.9%	
No view	0.7%		0.5%	
N***	47,139		32,302	

* For precise wording of options see previous footnote 1;

** Figures weighted for females by 1.450 and for males by 0.8875 (those answering 'In another way' or not answering the gender question were given a weighting of 1). The unweighted figure in support of carrying a firearm on or off duty is a little higher at 58.7%;

*** Note: There were substantially more police officers at the time of the 2006 survey.

- We asked officers how regularly they had access to specific protective measures and Personal Protective Equipment. For officers for whom the provision of these measures was applicable to their role, 10% of officers said that they never had access to double crewing, 29% said that they never had access to Body Worn Video and 54% said that they never had access to Taser.

Table 14: Current frequency of access to protective measures and Personal Protective Equipment

	Double Crewing (N = 23,573)	Body Worn Video (N = 24,026)	Taser (N = 23,836)
Never	9.5%	28.8%	53.8%
When deemed necessary by an officer with appropriate authority	16.4%	1.5%	5.8%
Depends on availability of resources/officers	56.6%	7.6%	13.4%
Upon my request whilst I am on duty	5.6%	5.4%	3.8%
At all times whilst I am on duty	11.7%	55.1%	22.5%
At all times, including when I am off duty	0.2%	1.6%	0.7%

Unweighted table

- We also asked officers what forms of Personal Protective Equipment they wanted access to, and how regularly. For officers for whom the provision of these measures was applicable to their role, more than two thirds said that they wanted access to double crewing at all times whilst on duty. In addition, around three quarters said that they wanted access to Body Worn Video and to Taser at all times whilst on duty.

Table 15: Views on frequency of access to protective measures and Personal Protective Equipment

	Double Crewing (N = 24,796)	Body Worn Video (N = 26,026)	Taser (N = 26,938)
Never	0.9%	2.1%	3.6%
When deemed necessary by officer with appropriate authority	6.9%	2.4%	4.8%
Upon my request whilst on duty	21.0%	13.4%	11.5%
At all times while on duty	68.4%	78.1%	74.6%
At all times, including when off duty	2.8%	3.9%	5.4%

Unweighted table.

- Finally, officers were asked about how satisfied they were that armed support was readily available should they require it. This question asked in the same format as the 2006 survey. 56% of officers said that they were either not very satisfied or not at all satisfied that armed support would be readily available should they require it.
- Therefore, again there has been a sizable increase in the proportion of officers who were not satisfied that armed support was readily available since 2006, when 43% of officers said that they were either not very satisfied or not at all satisfied that armed support would be readily available should they require it.

Table 16: How satisfied are you that armed support is readily available should you require it?

	2006		2017**	
Very satisfied	9.9%		7.3%	
Fairly satisfied	45.4%		34.7%	
Not very satisfied	29.0%	} 42.7%	34.7%	} 56.3%
Not at all satisfied	13.7%		21.6%	
No view	2.0%		1.7%	
N	47,253		32,166	

* Figures weighted for females by 1.450 and for males by 0.8875 (those answering 'In another way' or not answering the gender question were given a weighting of 1). The unweighted figure for satisfaction with armed support was very similar at 57.4%

** Note: There were substantially more police officers at the time of the 2006 survey.