

Final Report on Police Officers' Tattoos Survey 2016 25 October 2016

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	Not for open publication. Restricted to:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Confidential	

Contents

1. Key Findings.....	3
2. Background.....	4
3. Who has tattoos?.....	6
4. Number of tattoos and their location on the body.....	9
5. Tattooed officers' perceptions of any force issues.....	10
6. Reason(s) given by officers for having or not having tattoos.....	10
7. Views on employment prospects among officers with visible tattoos.....	11
8. Force policies and content.....	12
9. Views of officers without tattoos working with colleagues with visible tattoos.....	13

1. Key Findings

- Overall 48% of officers have a tattoo and 17% have a visible tattoo when in uniform;
- Younger officers are more likely to have a tattoo and visible tattoo than older officers;
- Officers with no qualifications are more likely to have a tattoo and visible tattoo than those with a degree;
- Officers with less than 20 years' service are more likely to have a tattoo and visible tattoo than those longer in service;
- Constables and sergeants are more likely to have a tattoo and visible tattoo than inspecting ranks;
- 63% of all tattoos are on the arm, back and shoulder whereas 88% of all visible tattoos are either on the lower arm or wrist;
- 93% of officers with visible tattoos have not encountered any issues with managers, professional standards, other colleagues or public service workers, or the general public;
- On the whole officers with visible tattoos hold positive views on their employment prospects – 83% not worried about promotion prospects; 93% having no employment regrets about their tattoos; 72% never stopped them getting a role they wanted; and 83% never experienced discrimination at work;
- Among officers who chose not to get a tattoo, only 21% gave as the reason that they thought it “not professional”. Only 13% of 18-34 year olds mentioned this as a reason compared to 25% of those aged 45 and over;
- Among officers without a tattoo 55% said they felt comfortable or very comfortable working with colleagues with visible tattoos. Officers aged 18-34 were twice as comfortable working with visibly tattooed colleagues as those 45 or over;
- About two-thirds of all officers were aware of a force policy on tattoos, but 30% did not even know if there was a policy.

2. Background

The Police Officers' Tattoos Survey was conducted by the Police Federation of England and Wales and was open from the 4th to 29th August 2016. PFEW's National Members' Database (NMDB) was used to draw a 10% sample of all officers so as to be representative of all officers whilst avoiding the burden on officers of an all officer survey. However, since the NMDB currently covers officers in 40 of the 43 England and Wales forces, it was necessary to top up the sample with responses from the three relatively small forces not included in the database.¹ It was not possible to draw a sample so all officers in these forces were eligible to complete the survey.

The purpose of the survey was to better inform the current debate about visible tattoos as an issue in the police service. Since Home Office guidance on tattoos² is vague and open to interpretation we are starting to see different standards across the 43 forces. It would also appear that more and more policies are being redrafted, which can result in a tattoo that an officer could have yesterday not being permissible under some new policies. Such policies are requiring officers to cover up their tattoos even in the hottest weather. Many of these changes have been made without an evidence base, either of officers' own attitudes towards tattoos nor the public's views of police officers with visible tattoos.

A public attitudes survey conducted by IpsosMori will gauge the public's views, whilst this PFEW survey will focus on police officers by ascertaining the extent to which officers have visible tattoos when in uniform, the nature of those tattoos, whether there are demographic differences between tattooed and non-tattooed officers which could have equality implications, whether working relationships have been affected

¹ The three forces with federated officer numbers in brackets are Bedfordshire (1,066), Dyfed-Powys (1,134) and Hampshire (2,849).

² NPIA document, *Police Officer Recruitment: Eligibility Criteria for the role of police constable*, pp23-24 (Guidance on tattoos and body piercing) http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Support/Recruitment/Documents/NPIA_022011.pdf. See also Police Could You on Home Office website <http://www.policecouldyou.co.uk/police-officer/am-i-eligible/detailed-eligibility-req/index.html>

by causing issues with colleagues, other workers and the public, and non-tattooed officers' feelings about working with officers with tattoos.

There were 4,456 responses to the survey covering all federated ranks from constable to chief inspector. Of these, 3,453 responses came from 40 NMDB forces and 1,003 came from the 3 non-NMDB forces. The response rate for NMDB forces was 29% (out of a total sample of 11,800 officers), whilst the non-NMDB response was just under 20% (out of a total of 5,049 officers in force). Consideration was given to weighting responses to take account of these methodological differences, but an analysis of both socio-demographics and also other questions suggested that there was not a significant difference in responses between these two groups of officers. For example, there was little significant statistical difference in terms of most demographic characteristics such as age (chi-squared p value=0.09), highest educational qualification ($p=0.4$), marital status ($p=0.2$), length of service ($p=0.96$) and rank ($p=0.97$).³ There was also very little difference in respect of certain attitudes central to the survey such as the degree to which officers are tattooed or not ($p= 0.7$), whether or not forces have a tattoos' policy ($p=0.5$), comfortable working with tattooed colleagues ($p=0.1$) and whether tattoos caused any issues with other groups (managers, PSD, other colleagues, other public sector collaborators and members of the public) ($p=0.1$).

In terms of their demographics officers responding to the survey are also fairly representative of federated ranks as a whole. The survey found 69% male compared with 71% in recent Home Office workforce data. Likewise, 76% in the survey are constables (Home Office 79%), 55% have less than 15 years' service

³ The probability (p) value for the chi-squared test tells us whether the deviation of observed values from expected values is due to chance or other factors. If $p > 0.05$ the deviation is small enough that chance alone accounts for it. For example, a p value of 0.6 means there is a 60% probability that any deviation from expected values is due to chance only. If p is < 0.05 the deviation from expected values is large enough to conclude that some factor other than chance accounts for it. For example, a p value of 0.01 means there is only a 1% chance this deviation is due to chance alone. Only exceptions are where one might expect – ethnicity (0.001) and roles (0.001). However, in respect of ethnicity the overwhelming majority of both groups are white (93% vs. 97%), and in terms of roles only response (32% vs. 28%) and investigation and investigative support (25% vs. 27%) are noticeably different. There also seems to be a slight gender difference at the 5% level ($p = 0.04$) but both groups are overwhelmingly male (69% NMDB; 66% non-NMDB).

(60%) and 94% are white (94%).⁴ There is also a close match between roles reported in the survey and Home Office data on local policing roles (figures in brackets):

Response 31% (27%), investigation and investigative support 26% (25%), neighbourhood policing 11% (17%), operational support 6% (6%), intelligence 6% (4%), roads 4% (4%). custody/criminal justice 3% (2%) and others 14% (14%).

3. Who has tattoos?

All officers responding to the survey were asked whether or not they had a tattoo, and if they did whether or not they had a visible tattoo. 95% of respondents answered these two questions. Overall 31% of officers have a tattoo(s) that was not visible when in their uniform, 17% have a visible tattoo(s) when in uniform and 52% do not have a tattoo. Among all officers with tattoos, 35% have a visible tattoo (17% of 48%).

The demographic breakdown of tattooed officers (48% of all officers) is as follows:

- 52% of female officers have a tattoo compared with 47% of male officers ($p=0.002$);
- 49% of white officers have a tattoo compared with 44% of non-white officers (includes mixed ethnicity) ($p=0.2$);
- 54% of 18-24 year olds have a tattoo compared with 57% of 25-34 year olds, 52% of 35-44 year olds, 38% of 45-54 year olds and 29% of officers aged 55 and over ($p=0.001$);
- 59% of officers with no qualifications have a tattoo compared with 55% with highest qualification of GCSEs, 50% with A-levels, 49% with higher education qualifications below degree level, 38% with degrees⁵ ($p=0.001$);

⁴ Home Office workforce data at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/police-workforce-england-and-wales-31-march-2016>

⁵ Among those with other qualifications such as foreign, vocational or work-related 61% have a tattoo.

- 57% of officers with less than 5 years' service have a tattoo compared with 57% with 5 years or more service but less than 10, 54% with 10 years or more service but less than 15, 48% with 15 years or more service but less than 20, 40% with 20 years or more service but less than 25, 29% with 25 years or more service but less than 30, and 32% with 30 years' service or more ($p=0.001$);
- 51% of constables have a tattoo compared with 40% of sergeants, 31% of inspectors and 30% of chief inspectors ($p=0.001$);
- 53% of officers with non-Christian religious beliefs have a tattoo compared with 53% with no religious beliefs and 44% of Christians ($p=0.001$);
- 55% of operational support officers have a tattoo compared with 53% of response officers, 50% of neighbourhood officers, 48% of intelligence officers, 42% of roads policing officers, 43% of investigation or investigative support officers, 35% of custody or criminal justice⁶ ($p=0.001$).

In summary based on statistically significant differences at the 1% level ($p<0.01$) tattooed officers are more likely to be female, younger (aged under 44), have no qualifications or minimum qualifications, less than 20 years' service), constables and sergeants, non-Christians (including no beliefs) and in operational support, response or neighbourhood roles.

There is a caveat to the finding in respect of educational qualifications. It could well be that age needs to be controlled for in order to assess better the argument that employers who are prejudiced towards those with tattoos may be missing out on employing talented individuals.⁷ That is older people are more likely not to have a tattoo irrespective of their qualifications, whereas younger entrants are more likely to

⁶ Among officers in other roles 49% have a tattoo.

⁷ See <http://www.xperthr.co.uk/commentary-and-analysis/visible-tattoos-is-it-time-to-relax-policies-on-employee-appearance/161358/?keywords=Acas+and+tattoos>. A recent ACAS Research Paper (Ref: 07/16), V Nath, S Bach and G Lockwood, *Dress codes and appearance at work: Body supplements, body modifications and aesthetic labour*, explores further employer perceptions on all aspects of staff appearance at work. See also on ACAS website, <http://www.acas.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=5842> and http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/9/b/Acas_Dress_codes_and_appearance_at_work.pdf

have a higher qualification or a degree. Therefore, in terms of future recruitment the relationship between higher qualifications and tattoos may be much closer. Indeed, controlling for age does suggest there could be future difficulties for recruitment if those with tattoos are excluded. Comparing officers aged 18-34 with those 45 and over suggests that whilst those with a degree (46%) are still less likely than those with lower qualifications or no qualifications to have a tattoo (65% and 77%), they are twice as likely to have a tattoo than older colleagues with a degree (23%). Younger officers with higher education *below* degree level are as likely to have a tattoo (65%) as their less qualified contemporaries (65% at GCSE level and 60% at A-level), whereas only 36% of older colleagues with such higher qualifications have a tattoo.

There is some variation when one looks specifically at officers with visible tattoos as a percentage of all officers with tattoos (overall 35% of all tattooed officers).

- 37% of male officers with a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 32% of female officers ($p=0.01$);
- 36% of white officers with a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 30% of non-white officers (including mixed ethnicity) ($p=0.2$);
- 29% of 18-24 year olds with a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 43% of 25-34 year olds, 36% of 35-44 year olds, 28% of 45-54 year olds and 5% of officers aged 55 and over ($p=0.001$);
- 49% of officers with no qualifications having a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 36% with highest qualification of GCSEs, 36% with A-levels, 40% with higher education qualifications below degree level and 30% with degrees⁸ ($p=0.05$);
- 36% of officers with a tattoo and less than 5 years' service have a visible tattoo compared with 42% with 5 years or more service but less than 10, 39% with 10 years or more service but less than 15, 37% with 15 years or more service but less than 20, 26% with 20 years or more service but less than 25,

⁸ Among tattooed officers with other qualifications such as foreign, vocational or work-related 37% have a visible tattoo.

24% with 25 years or more service but less than 30 and 11% with 30 years' service or more ($p=0.001$);

- 38% of constables with a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 30% of sergeants, 14% of inspectors and 12% of chief inspectors ($p=0.001$);
- 35% of officers with non-Christian religious beliefs and a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 36% with no religious beliefs and 35% of Christians ($p=0.99$);
- 41% of operational support officers with a tattoo have a visible tattoo compared with 43% of response officers, 38% of neighbourhood officers, 29% of intelligence officers, 32% of roads policing officers, 26% of investigation or investigative support officers, 27% of custody or criminal justice⁹ and 31% of officers in other roles ($p=0.001$).

In summary based on statistically significant differences ($p<0.01$) officers with visible tattoos are more likely to be male, aged 25-44, less than 20 years' service, constables and sergeants and in operational support, response or neighbourhood roles.

4. Number of tattoos and their location on the body

The average number of all tattoos (visible and non-visible) per officer reporting having a tattoo is just under 3. The average number of visible tattoos per officer reporting visible tattoos is just under 2. Bearing in mind that many officers have more than one tattoo, the most popular parts of the body for a tattoo (both visible and non-visible) are upper arms (25%), back/shoulders (24%), lower arms (14%), legs (8%), chest (7%) and wrist (6%).¹⁰ As for visible tattoos the most popular parts of the body are lower arms (63%), wrist (25%), hands (including fingers) (4%), and neck (3%).

⁹ Among tattooed officers in other roles 31% have a visible tattoo.

¹⁰ Although the survey question responses were pre-coded, respondents were able to specify other locations. The main categories reported by officers have therefore been added to the pre-coded categories to give an overall breakdown for location of both all tattoos and visible tattoos alone.

5. Tattooed officers' perceptions of any force issues

Among officers with tattoos (visible or non-visible) about half had tattoos before they joined and half only since joining. Among those getting tattooed only since joining, the overwhelming majority believed it had not cause any issues in the force (96%), with no difference whether the tattoo(s) was visible or not ($p=0.8$).

Officers with visible tattoos were specifically asked if their tattoos had caused any issues with their line manager, Professional Standards Department (PSD), other colleagues, members of other public services with whom they work or members of the general public. Once again the overwhelming majority of these officers said their tattoo(s) had caused no issues with any of the groups listed (93%).

6. Reason(s) given by officers for having or not having tattoos

Officers could provide more than one reason for their choice to get a tattoo or not. Among officers with tattoo(s) (visible or non-visible) the most frequent mention was one of aesthetics (liked the look) (64%), followed by the wish to remember someone (23%). The remaining mentions (accounting for 14%) covered various reasons such as religious (4%), alcohol was involved (3%), remember a time in their life (3%), military service (2%), peer pressure (1%) and youthful error (1%)¹¹

The main mentions recorded as to why officers without tattoo(s) chose not to get tattooed was they had just never considered it (44%), followed by aesthetics (don't like the look) (23%) and not professional (21%). About 9% of mentions covered various reasons such as a dislike of needles/pain (6%), religious (1%), work related issues (1%), too costly (0.3%), and too old now (0.2%). Interestingly, a further 5% said they had either considered or were about to get a tattoo. Those mentioning 'not

¹¹ Although responses were pre-coded, additional reasons were added from other reasons provided by respondents (i.e. remember time in life, military service and youthful error). Likewise among officers not having a tattoo, the following reasons were added to the pre-coded responses: work related issues, too costly, too old and considered/about to get a tattoo.

professional' as a reason were more likely to be older officers than younger officers (25% of those aged 45 and over compared to 13% of 18-34 year olds).

7. Views on employment prospects among officers with visible tattoos

Officers with visible tattoos were asked their feelings about visible tattoos and employment in general. They were asked if they agreed or disagreed with various statements linked to employment.¹²

On the whole officers with visible tattoos hold positive views on their employment prospects. They were not worried that their visible tattoos would hinder their future promotion prospects (83%); had no employment regrets about their tattoos (93%); and their visible tattoos had never stopped them getting a role in the police service they want (72%).

In their workplace the majority felt they had not been discriminated against because of their visible tattoos (83%) and had never considered having their visible tattoos removed for employment reasons (95%). As to covering up their tattoos at work, the majority say they are not required to cover up while at work (68%) and most do not feel they have to make an effort to hide their tattoos at work (75%). The overwhelming majority also agreed that other people at their workplace have visible tattoos (94%).

They were also presented with statements covering their views on tattoos in society in general and their view of tattoos in social settings. The majority felt tattoos are becoming more widely accepted in society (94%) and that eventually tattoos will be so widely accepted "theirs won't matter at all" (69%). The majority also did not regret their visible tattoos for non-employment reasons (93%), didn't cover up their tattoos

¹² Officers were asked for their feelings about visible tattoos and employment through a series of statements with which they were invited to agree or disagree using one of five responses from strongly disagree through to strongly agree.

in social settings (88%), never felt discriminated against in social situations because of their visible tattoos (88%) and never considered having their visible tattoos removed for non-employment reasons (90%)

Officers who have someone in their family with a tattoo are also more likely to have a tattoo themselves. Among officers with a tattoo (visible or non-visible) 74% report having a family member with a tattoo compared to only 57% of officers without a tattoo ($p=0.001$). Officers with a visible tattoo are even more likely to report a family member having a tattoo (80%).

8. Force policies and content

About two-thirds of officers were aware of a force policy on tattoos, but 30% said they did not know if there was a policy. Perhaps unsurprisingly, officers with tattoos (visible or non-visible) are more likely to be aware of a force policy (71%) compared with officers without tattoos (65%) ($p=0.001$). However, even 28% of officers with tattoos say they do not know if the force has a policy. This lack of knowledge may be partially explained by responses to the follow-up question to those officers who said their force had a policy. When asked if they thought the force policy has been properly communicated to officers in such a way that expectations are understood, 46% say it has not been properly communicated. In this respect there is no difference between tattooed officers and non-tattooed officers ($p=0.2$). If there is a communication problem it may not be surprising that a lot of officers do not even know if the force has a policy.

However, there would appear to be higher recognition of force policies in some forces than others. This may reflect the fact that some forces such as the MPS and Durham are known to have recently revisited their policies. Officers' recognition of force policies is especially high in 11 forces: Durham (97%), Surrey (96%), Gloucestershire (94%), MPS (93%), Northamptonshire (90%), Lincolnshire (89%), West Mercia (86%), West Yorkshire (86%), South Wales (85%), Merseyside (78%)

and Bedfordshire (78%). There are 7 forces where policy recognition is noticeably low: Dorset (16%), Avon and Somerset (29%), Cleveland (32%), Wiltshire (32%), Devon and Cornwall (35%), City of London (36%) and North Yorkshire (36%).

Officers aware of their force's policy were then asked to identify those elements they thought were included in the policy. The most frequently mentioned element was that tattoos are allowed if covered by the uniform (33%), certain types of tattoos, whether visible, covered or both, deemed potentially offensive or obscene are not allowed (30%), visible tattoos are allowed, but not those on one or more of face, neck and hands (28%)¹³, and 7% of mentions referred to all tattoos allowed unless offensive. Less than 1% mentioned all tattoos being banned by a force.

9. Views of officers without tattoos working with colleagues with visible tattoos

Officers without any tattoos were asked how comfortable they felt working with colleagues who have visible tattoo(s). Only 13% said they felt either uncomfortable or very uncomfortable working with such colleagues. The vast majority were either comfortable or very comfortable working with such colleagues (55%), while the remainder were neutral – feeling neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (32%).

Officers' views of working with colleagues who have visible tattoos are shaped somewhat by their view as to why they never got tattooed themselves. Noticeably, officers who considered tattoos not to be professional were more likely to feel uncomfortable working with tattooed colleagues (32%), followed by those not liking the aesthetics of tattoos (20%) and those giving religious reasons (16%).

There are also clear generational differences which may have future implications for the service. Whereas 82% of 18-24 year olds and 76% of 25-34 year olds are comfortable working with colleagues with visible tattoos, this falls to 43% among 45-

¹³ Of the 28% saying visible tattoos are allowed with restrictions, 15% said not on face, neck and hands, 9% not on the face and hands, and 4% not on the face only.

54 year olds and 39% of those aged 55 and over ($p=0.001$). Although there is a noticeable increase among older officers feeling uncomfortable (18% of those aged 45 and over compared to 6% of 18-34 year olds), there is also a noticeable increase among those who are neither comfortable nor uncomfortable (39% of those aged 45 and over). So even among older officers there are far more who feel comfortable working with officers with visible tattoos than feel uncomfortable.

Officers were given the opportunity to say why they felt comfortable or uncomfortable working with colleagues with visible tattoos. About a quarter of those answering the initial question provided an open-ended response explaining their answer. These open-ended responses provide some insight into the underlying complexity of previous responses, most notably the 32% who took the neutral position of feeling neither comfortable nor uncomfortable working with colleagues with visible tattoos. Many took the view that although not personally offended or bothered by tattooed colleagues, they could still express the view that tattoos are not appropriate for officers in uniform and look unprofessional. This is not surprising given that 21% of non-tattooed officers gave “not professional” as one of the reasons for their decision not to have a tattoo, and 45% of those 21% also gave a neutral response to the question about being comfortable or uncomfortable working with tattooed colleagues. Therefore there is a tendency for these officers to qualify their neutral position with some negative comments:

“If I was working with a colleague who had tattoos on their hands / neck / face then I would feel uncomfortable when dealing with some victims (particularly elderly) as they seem less tolerant of them than the younger generations.” (Constable, male, 12 years’ service);

“It depends on the tattoo. Some are hideous and look unprofessional, especially when dealing with sensitive issues such as sexual offences. However other tattoos can be quite artistic and I don’t have a problem with them.” (Constable, female, 7 years’ service);

“Single discrete tattoos are okay but full arm sleeves or similar are not.” (Constable, male, 28 years’ service);

"I don't like tattoos, but accept that it is a personal choice. Most colleagues who have tattoos cover them up, but some are visible on wrists or upper arms. I prefer that they cover them, but don't get hung up if they don't." (Inspector, male, length of service unknown);

"Very dependent on the tattoo but heavily tattooed areas do make me feel uncomfortable." (Sergeant, female, 25 years' service).

However, most open-ended responses reflect the positive aspects of allowing officers to have visible tattoos. Many felt it either makes no difference as long as the officer is good at their job; it better reflects a changing society; it makes the police more representative of society; and in some circumstances may assist officers in their dealings with members of the public.

Regarding working relationship:

"It makes no difference to the quality of the job dealt with." (Sergeant, male, 13 years' service)

"I don't believe that somebody having a tattoo has any bearing whatsoever on the capability to do their job professionally....." (Constable, female, 7 years' service)

"A bit of ink on someone's arm does not effect (sic) their role or their skill as an officer." (Constable, male, 5 years' service)

"I wouldn't say it is something I think about when working with anyone." (Constable, female, 13 years' service)

".....Some of the people I work with who have tattoos are some of the best officers I know." (Constable, male, 3 years' service)

"Tattoos have no bearing on the professionalism of the officer. To think or even question that would be discrimination." (Constable, male, 13 years' service)

Regarding changes in society:

"Tattoos are part of modern society and people should be accepted with them without any kind of prejudice." (Constable, male, 18 years' service)

"Tattoos are more popular in society in general so are accepted." (Inspector, male, 22 years' service)

"I have no issues with tattoos, they are commonplace and many of the people I know (including all my brothers and sisters) have tattoos." (Constable, male, 8 years' service)

"I believe that tattoos in general have seen a resurgence in popularity and that generally they have become more visible in society. This is true of both males and females. There was previously I believe a stigma associated with tattoos but I believe this to be changing." (Constable, male, 30 years' service)

"They have become increasingly common in society in general over the past few years, and as the police should reflect society overall, then I would expect to see officers with tattoos." (Inspector, male, 25 years' service)

"Most tattoos are now aesthetically pleasing on the eye and are more artistic than old ex-servicemen anchors, swallows and scrolled names." (Inspector, male, 20 years' service)

Regarding a more representative police service:

"We talk about more visibly resembling the communities we represent; but not when it comes to tattoos, why would that be?" (Chief Inspector, male, 26 years' service)

"I think it is important for Police Officers to represent the community. Tattoos are an everyday element of our community and can make Officers relatable." (Constable, female, 1 year service)

"Sadly, tattoos seem to be all the rage - Beckham, MTV etc. In that respect, police could be seen to be representative and officers ""in touch"" with public life / trends etc." (Sergeant, male, 17 years' service)

"...We are supposed to be chosen from the public to police the public. The public have tattoos so I don't really see what the issue is." (Constable, male, 13 years' service)

"They're not offensive and we work in a diverse community and therefore we should be a diverse workforce." (Constable, male, 12 years' service)

"We should represent the communities we serve we are continually told. A massive proportion of our communities have tattoos, should we not reflect the people we serve?" (Sergeant, male, 21 years' service)

"I think the policy is unrealistic, the community should be represented by officers from all sections of the community. A policy that officers with tattoos should cover them up, suggests to members of the public with tattoos that it is not acceptable." (Constable, male, 24 years' service)

"It shows individuality and respect for people with different views. The police although professional should seek to further engage with communities, many people have tattoos and therefore it illustrates that we are people too." (Constable, male, 3 years' service)

Regarding dealings with members of the public:

".....Most of the people we meet have tattoos. I don't see them as an issue. I have been in situations, where a suspect has commented on an officer's tattoos, and this has helped build a rapport and defuse situations." (Constable, male, 5 years' service)

“A lot of the time it can be an ice breaker with people who are anti-police.” (Constable, male, 16 years’ service)

“As long as the tattoos are not offensive I have no objection. Often when dealing with members of the public I believe it makes officers more human and more approachable.” (Constable, male, 14 years’ service)

“I have seen where officers with tattoos are spoken with purely on basis that they do have them. Whether that’s because of the design, colours, armed forces symbols, but is an item of common ground.....” (Constable, male, 17 years’ service)

“.....their tattoo's represent a part of who they are and part of the community they belong to. Some people relate better to officers with tattoos, front line they can become conversational topics to calm volatile situations down.....They are a part of what makes that person human.” (Constable, female, length of service unknown)

“I find the public relate well to colleagues with tattoos. It is a good ice breaker and the public seem more comfortable speaking to colleagues with tattoos as they say they are more representative of them (the public).” (Constable, male, 13 years’ service)