The Effect of Guardian-Focused Training for Law Enforcement Officers

Longitudinal Continuation

PHASE 3 FINAL REPORT

To the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission

June 30, 2019

Jacqueline B. Helfgott, PhD, Principal Investigator
Matthew J. Hickman, PhD Co-Investigator

SEATTLEU

Crime and Justice Research Center

The Effect of Guardian-Focused Training for Law Enforcement Officers

Longitudinal Continuation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project was a collaboration between the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission (WSCJTC) and Seattle University Department of Criminal Justice. Thanks to Executive Director Sue Rahr whose commitment to evidence-based practice provided the support for this independent evaluation of the WSCJTC BLEA curriculum. Special thanks for WSCJTC Staff Donna Rorvik, Marissa O'Neill, Tara Berlin, and Brian Elliot who assisted with project logistics. This research would not have been possible without the BLEA recruits and graduates who took the time to participate in this study to assist in improving law enforcement training in Washington State.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the third in a series of reports on the results of a longitudinal study of the effects of guardian-focused training in the Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA) at the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission (WSCJTC). This project was piloted in 2014-15 with a pre/post survey instrument at the WSCJTC BLEA to evaluate training effects of the guardian-oriented training implemented in 2012. The study follows 40 BLEA cohorts (710-750) through academy training pre/post and 1-year/3-year post-graduation. The results of the pilot study were reported in a Phase 1 Report entitled "Evaluation of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission's "Warriors to Guardians" Cultural Shift and Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Training" (Helfgott, et al., 2015). The study was continued July 2016-June 2017 to collect longitudinal data on the effectiveness of WSCJTC guardian-focused BLEA training at 6-months and 1-year post academy graduation. Phase 2 results were reported in a second report entitled, "The Effect of Guardian-Focused Training for Law Enforcement Officers" (Helfgott, et al., 2017). The study was continued in Phase 3 through April 2019 to collect longitudinal data 1 and 3-years post BLEA graduation. The current report presents Phase 3 longitudinal results adding analyses and findings from the 1-year and 3-year post-survey data to the findings presented in the Phase 1 and 2 reports.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to longitudinally evaluate the impact of the WSCJTC BLEA guardian-focused training curriculum. The Phase I Pilot project, "Evaluation of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission's Warriors to Guardians Cultural Shift and Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Training" was conducted in 2014-15 to develop the research design, implement the survey instrument, and collect pilot data from a survey instrument administered to BLEA recruits pre/post WSCJTC BLEA training and to a comparison sample of law enforcement personnel who completed BLEA prior to the implementation of guardian-oriented training in 2012. The pilot results were used to establish baseline measurements and construct validity for the survey instrument and to provide recommendations for longitudinal study of the impact of guardian-focused training in the BLEA at WSCJTC. In the Phase 2 longitudinal continuation, "The Effect of Guardian-Focused Training for Law Enforcement Officers," the survey instrument was modified based on the findings of the pilot study and ongoing data collection continued examining longitudinal training effects at 6-months and 1-year post-training as well as the relationship between officer characteristics and measures of guardian-focused training effectiveness. In this Phase 3 Report, findings from the 1-year and 3-year longitudinal follow-up surveys are presented.

Research Design

This study employed a mixed method design utilizing a pre/post/1-year/3-year survey instrument administered to BLEA recruits and a comparison sample. The study involved three phases – The Phase I pilot study, the Phase 2 longitudinal continuation that involved administration of the pre/post survey instrument to 40 cohorts and at 3-month, 6-month, and 1-year post-BLEA graduation, and the current Phase 3 longitudinal study reporting data 1-year and 3-years post BLEA graduation.

In Phase 1, survey results from the BLEA pre/post surveys were compared to survey results from a comparison group of 1400 sworn law enforcement officers and civilians who graduated from BLEA in the ten-year period between July 2004 and July 2014 who responded to a statewide survey sent out to nearly 4,716 BLEA graduates across Washington State in February 2015. Scales were validated as measures of guardian-focused training effectiveness. In Phase 2, data was analyzed examining the impact of training on seven scales constructed to measure elements of the guardian-focused training at the academy: 1) Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, 2) Negative Police Subculture, 3) Organizational Support, 4) Guardianship/Respect, 5) Guardianship/Empathy, 6) CIT Support, and 7) CIT Organizational Value.

In Phase 2, data was analyzed from 1190 pre- surveys and 941 post-surveys administered to BLEA recruits from November 2014 through April 2017 with a follow-up survey administered to BLEA graduates at 3-months, 6-months and 1-year post-graduation. Additionally, in Phase 2 the survey instrument was revised based on the pilot study with the revised survey implemented with BLEA Cohort 738 beginning July 7th, 2016 through BLEA Cohort 750 beginning on February 22, 2017. The revised instrument was administered at post-test beginning with BLEA Cohorts 733 through 750. Longitudinal continuation commenced involving pre/post administration of the survey in the BLEA classes at 1-year and 3-year post-graduation.

In Phase 3, follow-up surveys were administered 1-year and 3-years post-graduation from the end of the phase 2 period in April 2017 through April 2019. Phase 3 findings from the 1-year and 3-year follow-up surveys is presented in the current report. Between-subject longitudinal analysis was conducted for pre/post, 1-year, and 3-year survey data for a subset of BLEA recruits who participated in the longitudinal follow-up.

Summary of Findings

This report presents Phase 3 results with focus on the findings from the pre/post/1-year/3-year longitudinal follow-up data collected from BLEA cohorts from November 2014 through April 2019. The Phase 3 component of the study provides data that supplements Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports to help answer the project research questions:

Research Question #1 – Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA in comparison with law enforcement personnel who completed BLEA prior to the implementation of guardian-oriented training? (Measured by pre/post survey administration at the beginning/end of BLEA compared with cross-sectional survey responses from a comparison sample comprised of law enforcement personnel who graduated before the guardian-oriented curriculum was implemented)?
This question was addressed in the Phase 1 Pilot Study Report.

Research Question #2: Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA? (Measured by the pre-survey administration at the beginning of BLEA and post-survey completed during the last day of the academy?)
This question was addressed in the Phase 2 Longitudinal Continuation Report.

Research Question #3: Do officer characteristics predict effectiveness of the guardian style of policing? (Controlling for officer demographic and personality characteristics measured through the *Self-Report Psychopathy-SF*).
This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Reports.

Research Question #4: Are BLEA guardian-focused training effects sustained over time? (Measured at BLEA pre/post and 1-year/3-year post-graduation?)
This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Longitudinal Continuation Reports.

Results from the 1-year and 3-year longitudinal analysis show long-term sustained stability over time and significant increases in key elements of guardian-focused training, in particular with respect to the CIT Support scale, behavioral crisis items, and key items on the CIT scenarios. In addition, findings suggest that personality (as measured through the SRP-SF) moderates training effects in particular with respect to the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Guardianship-Empathy, Guardianship-Respect, Negative Police Subculture scales.

In the between-subject analysis of responses on the scales at pre/post/1-year/3-year, results show a statistically significant increase of 6.6-points in ratings from the pre-test average of 83.4, to the post-test average of 90.0, following completion of training on the **Burnout/Emotional Intelligence** scale. The one-year follow-up score was also significantly higher than the pre-test at 86.6, but the three-year follow-up score did not test as significantly different from the pre-test score. On the **Organizational Support** scale, results show no statistically significant change from the pre-test average of 76.5 to the post-test average of 76.2, but this was followed by a significant decrease of 4.2 points in ratings to the one-year follow-up average of 72.0, and another 4.7 points to the three-year follow-up average of 67.3, following completion of training. On the **CIT Support** scale, the results show a statistically significant increase of 23.7 points in ratings from the pre-test average of 52.4, to the post-test average of 76.1, following completion of training. This increase from the pre-test average was sustained at the one-year (72.6) and three-year (68.4) follow-ups. On the **CIT Organizational Value** scale, results show a statistically significant increase of 9.2-points in ratings from the pre-test average of 73.6, to the post-test average of 82.8, following completion of training. However, average scores returned to pre-test levels at the one-year (77.3) and three-year (71.7) follow-ups. For the remaining scales (**Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship/Empathy, Guardianship /Respect**), there was no statistically significant change in average ratings across all four measurement points. In the within subject analyses, statistically significant changes were observed in four of the seven scales. Specifically, there was an average increase of about 6-points on the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale; an average decrease of about 3-points on the Guardianship – Empathy scale; an average increase of about 19-points on the CIT Support scale; and an average increase of about 5-points on the CIT Organizational Value scale. These results are largely consistent with the ANOVA findings (except for the Organizational Support scale for which an aggregate increase was observed in the ANOVA model with no corresponding within-individual change observed and the Guardianship-Empathy scale for which no aggregate change was observed in the ANOVA model but showed a within-individual decrease).

For the **behavioral crisis** items, statistically significant changes in average ratings were observed for pre- and post-test groups in all but three of the seven items: *"My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly," Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly,"* and *"My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly."* These three items showed no significant change for the pre- and post-test groups. There were significant increases in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the items, *"Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work"* (a 5.6-point increase), *"Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous"* (a 6.0-point increase), *"I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis"* (a 10.5-point increase), and these increases were sustained to the three-year follow-up survey. There was also a significant increase in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events"* (a 6.7-point increase), but average ratings at the one- and three-year follow-ups were not significantly different from the pre-test level. Results from the within-subjects paired *t*-tests show statistically significant changes in all but one of the seven items. Specifically, there was an average increase of about 5- and 7-points, respectively, on the first two items, "*Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work*" and "*Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous*", and an average increase of about 7-points on the item, "*I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.*" There was an average decrease of about 7-points on the item, "*My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly,*" and an average decrease of about 5-and 6-points, respectively, on the last two items, "*Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*" and "*My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.*" There was no statistically significant change in the item, "*I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.*" These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings (except for the fourth item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events"* that exhibited no change within-individuals with an increase observed in the ANOVA model between pre- and post-test groups).

Results from the between-group ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests on the **crisis scenarios** show that for the **Depression** scenario show that officers correctly and consistently associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression at all four points of measurement. There was an increase in average pre- to post-test ratings on the item related to no increased risk of attempted suicide, but the one- and three-year averages were not significantly different from the pre-test level, and there was no difference in averages for the item related to increased risk of suicide-by-cop at all four points of measurement. Officers identified the need to assess the subject's mental state as the first priority at all four points of measurement (with the three-year follow-up significantly higher than the pre-test level). Gaining entry to secure weapons and restrain the subject was identified as a secondary priority (and there was an average decrease on this item from pre-test to three-year follow-up). A substantial decrease of about 32-points was observed in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself,"* And this decrease was sustained to the three-year follow-up measurement. There was also a decrease in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face"* although the one- and three-year scores were not significantly different from the pre-test level. Finally, respondents in all groups strongly endorsed the item, *"Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone"* with a significant increase from pre- to post-test. Results from within subjects paired *t*-tests for the Depression scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a small but statistically significant increase.

Results from the within-subjects paired sample *t*-tests for the **Schizophrenia** scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Schizophrenia in both their pre- and post-test responses with no statistically significant difference. There was an average decrease of about 6- and 13-points, respectively, in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Depression. Notably, there was a substantial average decrease of about 25-points on the item, "*In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her."* There was also an average decrease of about 13-points on the item, "*If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her"* and an average increase of about 12-points on the item, "Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation." These results are consistent with the between-subjects ANOVA findings.

Results from within-subjects paired sample *t*-tests for the **Dementia or Alzheimer's** scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Dementia or Alzheimer's in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a significant increase from pre- to post-test. There were decreases in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Schizophrenia. Notably, there was an average decrease of about 10- points on the item, *"You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave,"* instead favoring more comprehensive responses such as recognizing the need for outside help including friends or family members, and calling a Geriatric Regional Assessment Team (GRAT) or Mobile Crisis Team (MCT). These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings.

Results from the analysis of **officer personality characteristics** show that officer demographic characteristics including gender, age, race/ethnicity, familiarity with CIT and SRP-SF scores were moderating variables associated with significant differences in scale ratings at baseline and change at post-test consistent with the Phase 2 findings. Officer characteristics including gender, personality, education, and race/ethnicity were associated with significant differences on several of the scales change ratings. Gender (identifying as female) was associated with significantly greater change on the Guardianship-Empathy scale. Personality (higher level of psychopathic personality traits as measured through SRP-SF scores) was negatively associated with Guardianship-Empathy scale ratings. Education (having a college degree) was positively associated with change ratings on the Negative Police Subculture scale. and race/ethnicity (identifying as nonwhite) was associated with greater change on the Negative Police Subculture. These findings suggest that officer characteristics impact training effects for specific components of guardian-focused training.

Results on the relationship between SRP-SF and scale ratings show that SRP-SF Affective subscale is significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Burnout/ Emotional Intelligence scale at both the post- and 1-year measurements, as is the Factor 1 score at 1-year. That is, individuals who scored higher on the affective subscale tended also to score lower on the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale. The SRP-SF total and lifestyle subscale are significantly and positively correlated with scores on the Negative Police Subculture scale at both pre-and 1-year measurements. The Factor 2 score is also significantly and positively correlated with scores at the 1-year point. That is, individuals who scored higher on the SRP-SF total, and the lifestyle and Factor 2 subscale, tended also to score higher on the Negative Police Subculture scale at these points in time. The SRP-SF interpersonal and Factor 1 subscales are significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Guardianship-Empathy scale at pre-BLEA. That is, individuals who scored higher on the interpersonal and Factor 1 subscales tended also to score lower on the guardianship empathy scale pre-BLEA. The SRP-SF total and all subscales, except the antisocial and Factor 2 subscales, are significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Guardianship-Respect scale at pre-BLEA. The SRP-SF total and subscales (except the interpersonal and antisocial subscales) are also significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the guardianship respect scale at the 1-year follow-up. That is, individuals who scored higher on the SRP-SF total and the SRP-SF subscales, tended to score lower on the guardianship respect scale. Finally, the SRP-SF interpersonal, affective, and Factor 1 subscale scores were significantly and negatively correlated with the CIT Support scale at pre-BLEA, indicating that individuals who scored higher on these SRP-SF subscales tended also to score lower on the CIT Support scale. The SRP-SF affective scale score was also significantly and negatively correlated with the CIT Support scale at the one-year follow-up. Finally, the SRP-SF Factor 2 subscale was significantly and positively correlated with the CIT Support scale post-BLEA. These results support the Phase 2 findings that officer personality (i.e., psychopathy-level) moderates guardian-oriented training effects.

Conclusion

The findings show sustained training effects for BLEA recruits as reflected in four of the seven scales used to measure guardian-focused training elements at the WSJTC BLEA with significant effects sustained over time reflected in ratings on the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Support, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value scales. Additionally, findings show that guardian-focused BLEA training has significant training effects sustained over time on recruits' knowledge of how to respond to behavioral crisis incidents, particularly regarding decision-making around nuanced response to individuals in behavioral crisis as reflected in results on the scenario items in the survey instrument. The most salient finding is the effect of guardian-focused training on officer support for CIT and knowledge of how to respond to incidents involving behavioral crisis. The training effects for the ratings on the CIT Support and Behavioral Crisis items were sustained over time at pre/post/1-year/3-year data collection points. This is an important finding given the centrality of CIT elements in guardian-focused academy training. The findings of the Phase 3 longitudinal study presented in this phase 3 report including 1-year and 3-year longitudinal data collected through April 2019 are consistent with the Phase 1 Report results reported in June 2015 and the Phase 2 Report results reported in 2017. In addition, the Phase 3 findings show that training effects are moderated by psychopathy level supporting the preliminary results on the relationship between SRP-SF ratings and scale ratings found in the Phase 2 of the study. Consistent with the prior two reports, the findings presented in the Phase 3 Report support ongoing use of the guardian-focused training at the WSCJTC, particularly with respect to training effects on officer burnout/emotional intelligence, organizational support, attitudes toward CIT, and knowledge about how to interact with individuals in behavioral crises.

Project Goals

This project seeks to understand the effect of guardian-focused training at the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission's (WSCJTC) Basic Law Enforcement Academy (BLEA). The BLEA is a 6-month basic law enforcement training curriculum required of all law enforcement personnel in Washington State. Guardian-focused training, implemented when Sue Rahr moved from her position as King County Sheriff to Executive Director of the WSCJTC in 2012, is comprised of procedural justice, empathy-building, and de-escalation elements including LEED – *"Listen and Explain with Equity and Dignity,"* Blue Courage, and Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) training. The shift from the historical "warrior-style" paramilitary training at the academy to guardian-focused training brought key changes to the BLEA curricula including specific training components that integrate procedural justice (Tyler, 2001, 2006, Tyler & Huo, 2002) and behavioral and social science findings with law enforcement education to improve officer safety and public trust (Rahr & Rice, 2015).

The results reported here are part of a multi-phased approach to collect longitudinal data following BLEA recruits through academy training and after they join their agencies five years post-graduation. The study follows 40 BLEA cohorts beginning with Class 710 (who began the academy on November 18, 2014) through Class 750 (who began the academy February 22, 2017) through academy graduation and 1- and 3-year post-graduation. This report presents Phase 3 results from the longitudinal study of the effects of guardian-focused training at WSCJTC's BLEA reviewing pre/post BLEA survey findings and presenting data from pre/post/1-year/3-year surveys administered to BLEA recruits from November 2014 through April 2019. The longitudinal findings presented in this Phase 3 Report are from data from 360 pre-surveys, 394 post-surveys, 140-1-year surveys, and 116-3-year surveys completed by BLEA graduates who volunteered to participate in the longitudinal follow-up. The findings include between-subjects findings for the BLEA recruits who completed the pre/post/1-year/3-year surveys and individual within-subjects comparison for the recruits for whom pre- and post-test measures could be individually linked. The research initiative includes the following phases:

Phase I—(1) Establish comparative baseline metrics between the cohort(s) and the comparison group and validate the instrument, (2) Analyze differences between the comparison group and the study cohorts, (3) Analyze training effects by administering the survey to recruits at the beginning of their academy experience and the last day of the academy, and (4) compare knowledge and attitude measures.

Phase 2--Transfer operational elements of primary data collection to WSCJTC for completion of the cohort data collection; initiate first follow-up waves (3-months, 6 months, 1-year post-BLEA graduation), data collection and continue to analyze results.

Phase 3--Transfer operational elements of primary data collection to WSCJTC for completion of the cohort data collection; continue 1-year follow-up wave and initiate 3-year follow-up wave data collection and continue to analyze results.

Focus of Phase 3 Longitudinal Study

The Phase 3 study extends Phase 1 and Phase 2 through a data collection effort to include BLEA graduates who completed 1-year and 3-year post BLEA follow-up surveys through April 2019. This report presents findings that extend the Phase 1 Pilot Study (Helfgott, et al, 2015) and Phase 2 Longitudinal Continuation Study (Helfgott, et al, 2017). The Phase 3 component of the study involved continued administration of 1-year and 3-year follow-up instruments to BLEA graduates. The Phase 3 Study included:

1. Administration of longitudinal administration of the instrument at 1- and 3-year post-completion of BLEA training through April 2019 (including 1-year data from cohorts 710-750 and 3-year data from cohorts 710-728).

2. Inclusion of the SRP-SF items on the 1- and 3- year survey instrument for cohorts 710-732.[1]
3. Incorporation of the longitudinal 1- and 3-year follow-up data in the evaluation analysis.

The longitudinal continuation of the pilot study enables evaluation of training effects of the WSCJTC guardian-focused Basic Law Enforcement Academy training on quality of service to Washington State communities that will inform law enforcement screening, training, and the interaction between officer characteristics and personality, organizational culture, and guardian-focused law enforcement training.

Research Questions

This report presents Phase 3 results with focus on the findings from the pre/post/1-year/3-year longitudinal follow-up data collected from BLEA cohorts from November 2014 through April 2019. The Phase 3 component of the study provides data that supplements Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports to help answer the project research questions:

Research Question #1 – Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA in comparison with law enforcement personnel who completed BLEA prior to the implementation of guardian- oriented training? (Measured by pre/post survey administration at the beginning/end of BLEA compared with cross-sectional survey responses from a comparison sample comprised of law enforcement personnel who graduated before the guardian-oriented curriculum was implemented)?
This question was addressed in the Phase 1 Pilot Study Report.

Research Question #2: Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA? (Measured by the pre-survey administration at the beginning of BLEA and post-survey completed during the last day of the academy?)
This question was addressed in the Phase 2 Longitudinal Continuation Report.

Research Question #3: Do officer characteristics predict effectiveness of the guardian style of policing? (Controlling for officer demographic and personality characteristics measured through the *Self-Report Psychopathy-SF*).
This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Longitudinal Continuation Reports.

Research Question #4: Are BLEA guardian-focused training effects sustained over time? (Measured at BLEA pre/post and 1-year/3-year post-graduation?)
This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Longitudinal Continuation Reports.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were BLEA recruits who completed academy training from 2014-2017 (Cohorts 710-750) who completed pre/post/1-year/3-year surveys administered from November 2014 through April 2019. The data analyzed and reported in the current Phase 3 Report include data collected from pre/post/1-year surveys administered to WSCJTC BLEA Cohorts 710-750 and 3-year data collected for cohorts 710-728. The study in total follows 40 BLEA cohorts beginning with Class 710 (who began the

[1] Cohorts that completed the pre/post surveys prior to July 7, 2017 when the SRP-SF items were incorporated into the revised survey instrument.

academy November 18, 2014) through Class 750 (who began the academy February 22, 2017) through graduation and 1-year/3-year post-graduation. The findings presented in the current report are based on analysis of data from 360 pre-surveys, 394 post-surveys, 140 one-year surveys, and 116 three-year surveys. The findings include longitudinal analysis of pre/post, 1-year, and 3-year survey data for the subset of BLEA recruits who participated in the follow-up data collection period through April 2019. Table 1 presents demographic data for survey respondents at the four different points of measurement. As can be seen, across the four waves approximately 88% of the respondents are male, 76% are white. The average age at pre-test is 28.5 years, increasing to 32.8 years by the three-year follow-up. At pre-test over 40% have a BA/BS degree or higher, increasing to 47% at 1-year and 52% at 3-year.

Table 1

Background Characteristics of Phase 3 Survey Participants at Pre-Test (n=360), Post-Test (*n*=394), One-Year (*n*=140) and Three-Year (*n*=116) Follow-ups

	Pre-Test		***Post-Test***		***One-Year***		***Three-Year***	
	n (%)	***M(SD)***	***n (%)***	***M(SD)***	***n (%)***	***M(SD)***	***n (%)***	***M(SD)***
Gender								
Female	42 (11.7)	---	38 (9.7)	---	12 (8.6)	---	15 (13.2)	---
Male	316 (88.3)	---	353 (90.1)	---	127 (91.4)	---	99 (86.8)	---
Other	0 (0.0)	---	1 (0.3)	---	0 (0.0)	---	0 (0.0)	
Age								
	---	28.5 (6.0)	---	28.8 (5.6)	---	31.7 (6.7)	---	32.8 (6.0)
Total Years in Law Enforcement								
	---	0.9 (2.4)	---	1.3 (2.9)	---	3.1 (4.6)	---	4.1 (1.7)
Race/Ethnicity*								
Caucasian	273 (76.3)	---	301 (77.0)	---	108 (77.1)	---	95 (82.6)	---
African-American	10 (2.8)	---	8 (2.0)	---	7 (5.0)	---	3 (2.6)	---
Latino/Latina or Hispanic	33 (9.2)	---	37 (9.5)	---	5 (3.6)	---	6 (5.2)	---
Asian/Pacific Islander	23 (6.4)	---	19 (4.9)	---	9 (6.4)	---	2 (1.7)	---
Native-American/Alaskan Native	1 (0.3)	---	1 (0.3)	---	0 (0.0)	---	1 (0.9)	---
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	14 (3.9)	---	17 (4.3)	---	9 (6.4)	---	6 (5.2)	---
Other	4 (1.1)	---	8 (2.0)	---	2 (1.4)	---	2 (1.7)	---
Education								
HS/GED	33 (9.2)	---	30 (7.7)	---	7 (5.0)	---	5 (4.3)	---
Some College	103 (28.8)	---	115 (29.5)	---	35 (25.0)	---	28 (24.1)	---
AA/AS	64 (17.9)	---	66 (16.9)	---	26 (18.6)	---	15 (12.9)	---
BA/BS	145 (40.5)	---	166 (42.6)	---	66 (47.1)	---	60 (51.7)	---
JD	2 (0.6)	---	2 (0.5)	---	0 (0.0)	---	2 (1.7)	---
MA/MS	0 (0.0)	---	11 (2.8)	---	6 (4.3)	---	6 (5.2)	---
PhD/EdD	0 (0.0)	---	0 (0.0)	---	0 (0.0)	---	0 (0.0)	---
Current Rank								

Recruit	296 (84.3)	---	236 (60.7)	---	0 (0.0)	---	0 (0.0)	---
Officer	25 (7.1)	---	68 (17.5)	---	129 (92.1)	---	100 (86.2)	---
Student officer in field training	19 (5.4)	---	72 (18.5)	---	0 (0.0)	---	1 (0.9)	---
Other	11 (3.1)	---	13 (3.3)	---	11 (7.8)	---	15 (12.9)	---

Instruments

The survey instrument was developed during the Phase 1 pilot study (Helfgott et al, 2015) and revised for the longitudinal study based on the pilot study results. The revised survey instrument appears in Appendix A of the Phase 2 report (Helfgott et al., 2017). The survey is comprised of a General Attitude section including knowledge and attitude items designed to measure the effect of curriculum changes and a CIT section designed to measure knowledge and attitude items related specifically to incidents involving behavioral crisis and interactions with individuals in behavioral crisis. The General Attitudes section is based on the literature on officer attitudes toward abuse of authority (Weisburd, Greenspan, Hamilton, Bryant & Williams, 2001), empathy, and training effectiveness (Kirkpatrick, 1967; Dionne, 1996; Hung, 2010; Phillips, 1997; Smidt, Balandin, Sigafoos & Reed, 2009). The CIT section includes knowledge-based items and scenario-based queries designed to measure how officers would respond in practice. This portion of the survey was adapted from a prior project that measured the effect of CIT training for the Seattle Police Department (Helfgott, Conn-Johnson, & Wood, 2015).

The instrument is comprised of three sections: 1) Background, 2) General attitudes, 3) Crisis Intervention Team Training. An additional section 4) Self-Report Psychopathy-Short Form (SRP-SF) was added to the revised survey instrument to include a measure of officer personality style. The background section of the survey includes questions regarding demographic characteristics (age, race and sex, education), current rank, assignment, and agency, and prior experience with WSCJTC training components including Blue Courage©, and CIT Training. Survey questions included yes/no/forced choice questions, Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) ("slider scale") questions, and open-ended questions. Most of the survey sections and items that comprise the central measurement concepts were measured through VAS questions. When compared to Likert-scale questions, VASs allow for an unrestricted interpretation of a response and a detection of very small response changes. (Guyatt, Townsend, Berman, & Keller, 1987). Studies have shown that though not equivalent (Flynn, van Schaik, & van Wersch, 2004), both Likert-scales and VASs measure adequately subjective data. VASs are equidistant and similar to that of a Likert-scale (Reips & Funke, 2008) and they have higher responsiveness (sensitivity) than Likert-scale questions.

Sections of the survey instrument (General Questions and CIT Perceptions) were subjected to factor analysis and scales were created to measure concepts reflecting key curricular goals of guardian-focused law enforcement training. The general attitudes section of the instrument includes items that are used to construct the scales deemed relevant to the research questions. Factor analysis completed in Phase I indicated that all scales showed adequate reliability and suggested that scales could be improved by omitting some items in certain scales that did not load highly on the underlying factor. In Phase 2, researchers took into account Phase 1 factor analysis findings and improved scales by omitting those items that were not strongly correlated with other items on the scale, or their underlying factors.[2]

Burnout/Emotional Intelligence

The basic concepts present in guardian-focused training is that the officer must be aware of his/her own emotional states and affect to control them. Certain practices are taught to recruits (e.g. deep

[2] The pilot instrument also included a Social Tactics Scale which was removed from the revised survey instrument to make room for inclusion of the additional SRP-SF items included in the revised survey to measure officer personality style. The Social Tactics Scale measured elements of Tactical Social Interaction (TSI) Training. The scale was removed because though elements of TSI training overlap with elements of guardian-focused training, however TSI is not a standard component of BLEA.

breathing exercises) to help guard against burn-out and emotional exhaustion. This scale was constructed in the Phase 1 pilot to measure aspects of emotional intelligence and self-awareness. Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, the item *"It is inevitable that police officers become cynical about human nature"* was omitted from the revised instrument because it did not statistically load well on the underlying factor and Cronbach's Alpha increased from .54 to .63 with this item dropped from the scale. Figure 3 shows the survey question items that make up the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence Scale in the revised survey instrument.

Figure 3
Burnout/Emotional Intelligence Scale



Negative Police Subculture

Part of the concept of guardian policing is the idea that warrior-style policing creates an artificial and damaging divide between police officers and the public. This divide between the police and citizens is an element of police subculture. Because a goal of the guardian model is to counteract the negative aspects of police subculture, this scale was constructed based on prior research including items adapted from *the Officer Attitudes toward Abuse of Authority* (Weisburd, Greenspan, Hamilton, Bryant & Williams, 2001). Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, the item, *"Pretty much everything I do and who I socialize with is related to law enforcement and other police officers"* was omitted from the revised instrument because it did not statistically load well on the underlying factor and Cronbach's Alpha increased from .73 to .75 with this item dropped from the scale. Figure 4 shows the survey question items that make up the Negative Police Subculture Scale in the revised survey instrument.

Figure 4
Negative Police Subculture Scale

Organizational Support

This scale measures organizational support for guardian-training elements to examine the degree to which training effects are robust over time. Because guardian policing is rooted in procedural justice, and procedural justice is related to organizational justice concepts, the presumption is that police officers must feel that they are being treated fairly by the organization and that their organization is supportive of procedural justice goals. Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, the item, *"Police officers in my department respond to verbal abuse with physical force and nothing is done"* was omitted from the revised instrument because it did not statistically load well on the underlying factor and Cronbach's Alpha increased from .79 to .82 with this item dropped from the scale. Figure 5 shows the survey question items that make up the Organizational Support Scale in the revised survey instrument.

Figure 5
Organizational Support Scale



Guardianship/Empathy

A fundamental element of guardian-focused training is the development of empathy skills. Police officers need to be able to understand what is happening with citizens in crisis in order to effectively intervene in particular in crisis situations. The Jefferson Scale of Physician Empathy (Hojat, Gonnella, Nasca,

Mangione, Veloski, and Magee, 2002) was used to develop these items adapted to make the questions applicable to the law enforcement discipline. Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, the items, *"Because people are different, it is almost impossible for me to see things from the perspective of the subjects I am contacting" and "It is difficult for me to view things from mu subjects' perspective"* were omitted from the revised instrument because the items did not statistically load well on the underlying factor and Cronbach's Alpha increased from .63 to .76 with these items dropped from the scale. Figure 6 shows the survey question items that make up the Guardianship/Empathy Scale in the revised survey instrument.

Figure 6
Guardianship/Empathy Scale



Guardianship/Respect

This scale was constructed to measure a respectful approach to interactions with citizenry which is an essential element of the guardian model. Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, three items were removed from this scale -- *"Sometimes the things I have to say to do my job offend, "Treating people politely usually puts officers in danger because then they don't respect the officer's authority," and "I'll give people respect when they do what I tell them to do"* were omitted from the revised instrument because the items did not statistically load well on the underlying factor and Cronbach's Alpha increased from .60 to .71 with these items dropped from the scale. Figure 7 shows the survey question items that make up the Guardianship/Respect Scale.

Figure 7
Guardianship/Respect Scale

CIT Support

This measure provides an indicator of officer knowledge and support for the CIT model. The CIT perception items were adapted from an instrument developed for a Seattle Police Department survey of police culture and attitudes toward CIT. (Helfgott, Conn-Johnson, & Wood, 2015) to assess support for the CIT model and de-escalation approach in law enforcement. Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, Cronbach's Alpha for the full scale was equal to .88 and specific item removal would yield no improvement in reliability so no items were removed from this scale. Figure 8 shows the survey question items that make up the CIT Support Scale.

Figure 8
CIT Support Scale



CIT Organizational Value

This measure provides an indicator of perceptions of organizational support for the CIT model. The CIT Organizational Value items were adapted from an instrument developed for a Seattle Police Department survey of police culture and attitudes toward CIT (Helfgott, Conn-Johnson, & Wood, 2015). Based on the scale dimensionality and reliability analysis conducted in the Phase 1 pilot, Cronbach's Alpha for the full scale was equal to .87 and specific item removal would yield no reliability improvement, so no items were removed from this scale. Figure 9 shows the survey question items that make up the CIT Organizational Value Scale.

Figure 9
CIT Organizational Value

CIT Scenarios

CIT Scenarios and associated questions were developed with attention to the objectives of the WSCJTC In-service CIT Facilitator Guide and the 2014 King County Mock Scenarios used in current WSCJTC training and modeled after scenarios used in previous research to measure CIT training effectiveness (Bahora et al, 2008, Broussard et al, 2011, Compton et al, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2014a, 2014b; Hatfield, 2014). This section was included to assess participants' understanding and knowledge of the most effective and appropriate behavioral responses to various scenarios involving people in crisis exhibiting symptoms and behaviors associated with different mental health issues specific to content covered in the CIT component of BLEA course which focuses on de-escalation skills and knowledge and understanding of mental health conditions and behavioral crisis events considered an important component of guardian training.

The survey instrument included a set of three scenarios to assess participants' knowledge before and after the 8-hour CIT component in BLEA as well as continued practice of CIT understanding.[3] Scenarios were developed to represent specific situations police officers were likely to encounter recurrently in their daily work. These consisted of: (1) individuals who may be experiencing depression and who may be suicidal, (2) individuals who may be experiencing schizophrenic episodes, (3) individuals who are elderly and who may be experiencing dementia. Each scenario is followed by ten corresponding statements that outlined assessments officers might make regarding the possible mental health issue present, potential associated concerns officers might have, and possible behavioral responses officers might take.

SRP-SF

A 29-Item instrument called the *Self-Report Psychopathy Scale – Short Form* (SRP-SF) (Neal & Sellbom, 2012; Neumann, et al., 2007; Neumann, et al, 2014; Neumann & Pardini, 2014; Vitacco et al, 2014) was added to the revised pre/post BLEA survey. The SRP-SF is a standardized and validated self-report scale that measures personality features associated with the concept of psychopathy (Hare, 1993). The SRP-SF is an abbreviated version of the *Self-Report Psychopathy scale (SRP-4)* (Paulhus, Neumann, & Hare, 2016). The SRP and SRP-SF were developed as a self-report alternative to the *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (PCL-R) (Hare, 1990, 2003) and associated instruments that are time consuming to complete and make it difficult to assess psychopathy in large-samples and in the broader population because they require a clinical interview supplemented by collateral institutional file information that is generally not available in community populations that are not in forensic and criminal justice settings. The SRP and SRP-SF are strongly correlated with the PCL-R across a wide variety of samples with SRP traits associated with external correlates associated with psychopathy including criminal behavior, moral reasoning, amygdala activation to fearful faces, and emotional cues (Gordts et., al., 2017; Newman, 2015; Paulhus et al, 2016).

The PCL-R (Hare, 1990, Hare, 2003) is a 20-item instrument is a reliable and valid instrument used world-wide to measure psychopathy and many variants of the instrument have been published by Multi-Health Systems.[4] The full version of the SRP-4 is a 64-item measure that is four-factor model of psychopathy that reflects the four-factor model of psychopathy (Hare & Neumann, 2006) that evidences good internal reliability and promising criterion-related, convergent, and discriminant validity as well as construct validity with scores associated with criminal and violent behavior, thrill-seeking,

[3] The Pilot Study included an additional assessment of the effectiveness of the 40-hour CIT In-service training that utilized six CIT scenarios involving individuals in behavioral crisis involving Depression, Schizophrenia, Alzheimer's/Dementia, PTSD, Autism Spectrum, and Anger Management. The 8-Hours of CIT training in BLEA is a condensed version of the 40-hour training which was implemented into BLEA in 2014 as part of the guardian-focused training. The decision to utilize the three scenarios involving Depression, Alzheimer's/Dementia, and Schizophrenia for the BLEA assessment was made based on the incidence of these conditions in police-citizen interactions. Future research on the effects of guardian-focused training in a range of scenarios is an important next step in data collection efforts.

[4] For information on the PCL-R and related measures of psychopathy, see: https://ww2.mhs.com/results.

irresponsibility, callous affect, and lack of empathy. SRP-4 scores have been found to be predictive of extratest criteria such as blame externalization and narcissism that reflect prototypical characteristics of psychopathy such as grandiosity, manipulation and deceit in interactions with others (Neal & Sellbom, 2012). The PCL-R, the SRP, and the SRP-SF have been developed to measure two factors of psychopathy –Factor 1 characterized by selfishness, callousness, and remorseless use of others and Factor 2 characterized by social deviance and chronic unstable and antisocial lifestyle. A four-factor model has also been developed with Factor 1 divided into the two facets – Interpersonal and Affective and Factor 2 into the two facets – lifestyle and antisocial (Hare & Neumann, 2006).

Psychopathy has long been associated in the academic, criminal justice, and forensic literature with a constellation of interpersonal, lifestyle, affective, and antisocial personality features including grandiosity, callous lack of empathy, lack of remorse or guilt, impulsivity, stimulation seeking, and poor behavioral controls. The psychopathy construct has historically been applied to criminal populations and is considered *"one of the best validated clinical constructs in the realm of psychopathology, and arguably the single most important clinical construct in the criminal justice system"* (Hare, 1998, p. 189). The notion of the non-criminal "successful psychopath" has long been discussed in the literature (Cleckley, 1941; Dutton, 2012; Dutton & McNab, 2014; Hall & Benning, 2006). There has been increasing attention in recent years to the role of psychopathy in non-criminal populations and settings and the importance of conceptualizing psychopathy dimensionally with recognition that individuals with high levels of psychopathic traits form a heterogeneous group (Tew et. al., 2015). While the psychopathy construct has not been commonly applied to law enforcement populations, psychopathy has been associated with ruthless, cold, and remorseless behavior in non-criminal contexts such as business environments (Babiak, 2016; Babiak & Hare, 2006; Babiak & O'Toole, 2012) and interpersonal and family settings (Bernstein, 2001; Rule, 2013; Simon, 2010, 2011), and some have begun to examine the utility of the construct to explain extreme behaviors of law enforcement professionals (e.g., Sanford & Arrigo, 2007).

Level of psychopathy of law enforcement recruits is important to consider in determining the effectiveness of guardian-oriented training. The concept of successful psychopathy has only very recently been applied to law enforcement (Falkenbach, Glackin, & McKinley, 2018) suggesting that some psychopathic traits (decreased emotional response, low stress reactivity, and fearlessness) may aid an individual in carrying out police work, while other psychopathic traits (emotionally dysregulation, aggression, and impulsivity) can be detrimental to police performance (Falkenbach, McKinley, & Larson, 2017). The empirical association of features of psychopathy with lack of conscience, empathy, and remorse, low behavioral control, and deficits in moral reasoning make psychopathy-level a critical factor to consider in efforts to understand the impact of training on officer ability to empathetically and respectfully engage with citizens in the course of law enforcement duties. To better understand the role of personality as a moderating variable that can potentially influence training effects, the SRP-SF was included in the revised BLEA pre/post survey instrument as a measure of officer personality to examine the relationship between officer personality and officer demographic characteristics as independent variables and officer ratings on the dependent variable scale ratings on the 7 scales employed to measure the effect of the guardian-training: 1) Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, 2) Negative Police Subculture, 3) Organizational Support, 4) Guardianship/Respect, 5) Guardianship/Empathy, 6) CIT Support, and 7) CIT Organizational Value. All BLEA recruits in classes starting in September 2016 (BLEA Class 724 and up) were administered the revised survey instrument at post-test including these additional items.[5]

Procedure

The procedure for the pre/post BLEA data collection is explained in detail in the Phase 1 and 2 reports. For the pilot study and the Phase 2 component of the study, a Seattle University research

[5] BLEA graduates in the earlier cohorts 710-723 were administered the SRP-SF in the 1-year and 3-year survey instruments. The post-test SRP-SF results were presented in the Phase 2 Report. Continued longitudinal data collection will enable us to collect data from earlier cohorts to be able to conduct analyses using SRP-SF scores for a larger number of BLEA graduates. Results from this continued data collection effort will be presented in a subsequent report.

assistant served as a contracted embedded researcher with WSCJTC to conduct pre/post and longitudinal follow-up survey administrations of recruit participants. For these administrations, participants were either given access to academy tablets or they used their own laptop or smartphone to complete the survey. An informed consent section was the first section of the survey. Surveys were conducted using a web-based electronic format to increase response rate and accessibility.

Surveys administered to the cohorts were administered in a pre/post design. Survey scripts are included in Appendix C. The first survey, a pre-survey, was administered to recruits following successful completion of the Physical Ability Test (PAT) two weeks prior to the start of the academy. This date was selected to prevent contamination from course material recruits are asked to read prior to the first day of class. The pre-survey was administered following strenuous physical exertion and with the final knowledge that the recruit would be entering the academy, so artificial upward pressure on survey responses must be acknowledged. The post-survey was administered following completion of the comprehensive test administered two days prior to graduation. Similar to the pre-survey, the post-survey was administered at a point where the recruits had completed all coursework and knew they would be graduating. Upward pressure must be acknowledged at this point as well but was deemed to be roughly equivalent to pre-survey effects.

For the longitudinal component of the study, WSCJTC staff sent follow-up emails to BLEA graduates to solicit participation in the 1-year and 3-year follow-up surveys. BLEA graduates were offered a $5 Starbucks card in an email invitation that they could redeem whether or not they elected to participate in the follow-up survey. WSCJTC staff kept a calendar of all BLEA classes included in the study period and an excel sheet that had each officer who had been accepted into BLEA with information about class number, ID number, email, department, and records of the date that their surveys were completed. As the different surveys were completed and the recruits continued to participate in the survey, the excel sheet was updated; those who completed both the pre and post surveys were contacted the week of their 1-year and 3-year anniversary of graduating BLEA. Those who asked to be removed from the survey had their information removed from a working version of the excel sheet. In the case that an email did not work, it would be confirmed using the learning management system at the WSCJTC and any erroneous emails were corrected. In some cases, officers were dismissed from their department and therefore their emails were no longer working - these officers were also removed from the study. At first, Starbucks cards were being sent with the original emails.

RESULTS

Group Comparisons

The four groups (pre-test, post-test, one-year, and three-year follow-ups) average responses were compared across all scales using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), followed by Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) post-hoc test. Tables 2 and 3, below, summarize the results of the ANOVA models, and Figure 10 depicts the mean scores graphically for each group. Four of the scales yielded significant differences indicating increases from pre- to post-test averages (for the Burnout / Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Support, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value scales). The remaining three scales yielded no significant differences across the four groups indicating no change in pre- to post-test averages or in one-year and three-year follow-ups (for the Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship / Empathy, and Guardianship / Respect scales).

With regard to the Burnout / Emotional Intelligence scale, the results show a statistically significant increase of 6.6-points in ratings from the pre-test average of 83.4, to the post-test average of 90.0, following completion of training. The one-year follow-up rating was also significantly higher than the pre-test at 86.6, but the three-year follow-up rating did not test as significantly different from pre-test.

With regard to the Organizational Support scale, the results show no statistically significant change from the pre-test average of 76.5 to the post-test average of 76.2, but this was followed by a significant decrease of 4.2 points in ratings to the one-year follow-up average of 72.0, and another 4.7 points to the three-year follow-up average of 67.3, following completion of training.

With regard to the CIT Support scale, the results show a statistically significant increase of 23.7 points in ratings from the pre-test average of 52.4, to the post-test average of 76.1, following completion of training. This increase from the pre-test average was sustained at the one-year (72.6) and three-year (68.4) follow-ups.

With regard to the CIT Organizational Value scale, the results show a statistically significant increase of 9.2 points in ratings from the pre-test average of 73.6, to the post-test average of 82.8, following completion of training. However, average scores returned to pre-test levels at the one-year (77.3) and three-year (71.7) follow-ups.

For the remaining scales (Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship / Empathy, and Guardianship / Respect), there was no statistically significant change in average ratings across all four measurement points.

Table 2
ANOVA Results Comparing Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year and Three-Year Groups on Scale Ratings (group n's = 360, 394, 140, and 116 respectively)

		Group Statistics			*F-tests*		
Scale	***Group***	***Mean***	***SD***		***F***	***df***	***Sig.***
Burnout / Emotional Intelligence	Pre-test	83.4	11.6				
	Post-test	90.0	8.6		29.5	977	<.001
	One-Year	86.6	9.8				
	Three-Year	83.3	11.0				
Negative Police Subculture	Pre-test	37.9	16.3				
	Post-test	38.8	16.7		1.1	796	.354
	One-Year	40.2	19.0				
	Three-Year	41.3	21.1				
Organizational Support	Pre-test	76.5	14.4				
	Post-test	76.2	11.6		15.9	877	<.001
	One-Year	72.0	13.5				
	Three-Year	67.3	15.0				
Guardianship / Empathy	Pre-test	83.5	14.9				
	Post-test	81.0	14.6		2.0	964	.119
	One-Year	81.5	14.5				
	Three-Year	80.9	13.5				
Guardianship / Respect	Pre-test	82.3	14.9				
	Post-test	82.4	13.9		0.1	994	.982
	One-Year	82.4	13.1				
	Three-Year	81.8	14.2				
CIT Support	Pre-test	52.4	26.4				
	Post-test	76.1	16.5		59.3	744	<.001
	One-Year	72.6	18.2				
	Three-Year	68.4	21.6				
CIT Organizational Value	Pre-test	73.6	30.0				
	Post-test	82.8	20.7		10.3	883	<.001
	One-Year	77.3	18.8				
	Three-Year	71.7	21.8				

Table 3
Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Group Scores on Scale Ratings

Dependent Variable	***(I) Group***	***(J) Contrast Group***	***Mean Difference (I-J)***
	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-6.6*

Burnout / Emotional Intelligence Scale Score		One-Year	-3.2*
		Three-Year	0.04
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	6.6*
		One-Year	3.4*
		Three-Year	6.6*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	3.2*
		Post Survey	-3.4*
		Three-Year	3.2
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-0.04
		Post Survey	-6.6*
		One-Year	-3.2
Negative Police Subculture Scale Score	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-0.9
		One-Year	-2.3
		Three-Year	-3.4
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	0.9
		One-Year	-1.4
		Three-Year	-2.5
	One-Year	Pre Survey	2.3
		Post Survey	1.4
		Three-Year	-1.1
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	3.4
		Post Survey	2.5
		One-Year	1.1
Organizational Support Scale Score	Pre Survey	Post Survey	0.3
		One-Year	4.5*
		Three-Year	9.2*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-0.3
		One-Year	4.2*
		Three-Year	8.9*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-4.5*
		Post Survey	-4.2*
		Three-Year	4.7*
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-9.2*
		Post Survey	-8.9*
		One-Year	-4.7*
Guardianship Empathy Scale Score	Pre Survey	Post Survey	2.4
		One-Year	2.0
		Three-Year	2.6
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-2.4
		One-Year	-0.5
		Three-Year	0.2
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-2.0
		Post Survey	0.5
		Three-Year	0.7
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-2.6
		Post Survey	-0.2
		One-Year	-0.7
	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-0.04
		One-Year	-0.1

Guardianship Respect Scale Score		Three-Year	0.7
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	0.04
		One-Year	-0.02
		Three-Year	0.6
	One-Year	Pre Survey	0.1
		Post Survey	0.02
		Three-Year	0.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-0.6
		Post Survey	-0.6
		One-Year	-0.6
CIT Support Scale Score	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-23.7*
		One-Year	-20.3*
		Three-Year	-16.0*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	23.7*
		One-Year	3.5
		Three-Year	7.7*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	20.3*
		Post Survey	-3.5
		Three-Year	4.3
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	16.0*
		Post Survey	-7.7*
		One-Year	-4.3
CIT Organizational Value Score	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-9.2*
		One-Year	-3.7
		Three-Year	1.9
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	9.2*
		One-Year	5.5
		Three-Year	11.2*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	3.7
		Post Survey	-5.5
		Three-Year	5.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-1.9
		Post Survey	-11.2*
		One-Year	-5.6
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.			

Figure 10

Mean Differences on Scales for Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Groups

Scale	Data over time	Nature of change, Pre- to Post-BLEA	Was the change (or level) sustained over time?	Statistical evidence of sustained change (or level)

Burnout/EI		Increased	Sustained to one-year, then returned to pre-BLEA level	Post-BLEA and one-year higher than pre-BLEA and three-year
Negative Police Subculture		No change	No change	No significant differences
Organizational Support		No change	Declined at one-year and three-year	Pre- and post-BLEA not different; one-year and three-year significantly lower
Guardianship/ Empathy		No change	No change	No significant differences
Guardianship/ Respect		No change	No change	No significant differences

CIT Support		Increased	Sustained to one- and three-year	Post-BLEA, on- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
CIT Organizational Value		Increased	Returned to pre-BLEA level by 3-year	Post-BLEA significantly higher than pre- and three-year

We next examined group differences in responses to the behavioral crisis items. Results from the ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests are summarized in Tables 4 and 5, below, and Figure 11 depicts the means scores graphically for those items. As can be seen, statistically significant changes in average ratings were observed for pre- and post-test groups in all but three of the seven items*: "My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly," Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly," and "My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly."* These three items showed no significant change for the pre- and post-test groups.

There were significant increases in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the items, *"Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work"* (a 5.6-point increase), *"Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous"* (a 6.0-point increase), *"I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis"* (a 10.5-point increase), and these increases were sustained to the three-year follow-up survey. There was also a significant increase in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events"* (a 6.7-point increase), but average ratings at the one- and three-year follow-ups were not significantly different from the pre-test level.

Table 4
ANOVA Results Comparing Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Groups on Behavioral Crisis items (group n's = 360, 394, 140, and 116 respectively)

		Group Statistics			F-tests		
Scale	***Group***	***Mean***	***SD***		***F***	***df***	***Sig.***
Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work.	Pre-test	78.1	21.9				
	Post-test	83.6	16.7		9.8	990	<.001
	One-Year	86.0	19.0				
	Three-Year	86.7	20.6				
Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous.	Pre-test	72.2	23.9				
	Post-test	78.2	19.9		11.6	987	<.001
	Comparison	82.1	20.4				

		82.6	19.0				
I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.	Pre-test	71.5	24.8				
	Post-test	81.9	16.9		40.7	995	<.001
	One-Year	88.1	12.5				
	Three-Year	89.0	13.1				
I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.	Pre-test	58.3	31.0				
	Post-test	65.0	28.7		3.3	927	.020
	One-Year	64.8	28.9				
	Three-Year	60.9	30.5				
My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre-test	64.7	31.4				
	Post-test	62.5	29.1		12.6	949	<.001
	One-Year	52.6	31.0				
	Three-Year	47.2	31.9				
Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre-test	60.7	28.6				
	Post-test	57.7	27.5		8.6	931	<.001
	One-Year	50.5	29.6				
	Three-Year	46.9	30.5				
My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre-test	59.8	29.6				
	Post-test	55.1	28.1		9.5	917	<.001
	One-Year	49.4	29.6				
	Three-Year	44.1	31.2				

Table 5

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Group Scores on Behavioral Crisis Items

Dependent Variable	***(I) Group***	***(J) Contrast Group***	***Mean Difference (I-J)***
Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-5.6*
		One-Year	-7.9*
		Three-Year	-8.6*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	5.6*
		One-Year	-2.3
		Three-Year	-3.0
	One-Year	Pre Survey	7.9*
		Post Survey	2.3
		Three-Year	-0.7
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	8.6*
		Post Survey	3.0
		One-Year	0.7
Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-6.0*
		One-Year	-9.9*
		Three-Year	-10.4*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	6.0*
		One-Year	-3.9
		Three-Year	-4.5
	One-Year	Pre Survey	9.9*
		Post Survey	3.9
		Three-Year	-0.5
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	10.4*
		Post Survey	4.5

		One-Year	0.5
I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-10.5*
		One-Year	-16.6*
		Three-Year	-17.5*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	10.5*
		One-Year	-6.1*
		Three-Year	-7.0*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	16.6*
		Post Survey	6.1*
		Three-Year	-0.9
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	17.5*
		Post Survey	7.0*
		One-Year	0.9
I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-6.7*
		One-Year	-6.4
		Three-Year	-2.6
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	6.7*
		One-Year	0.2
		Three-Year	4.0
	One-Year	Pre Survey	6.4
		Post Survey	-0.2
		Three-Year	3.8
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	2.6
		Post Survey	-4.0
		One-Year	-3.8
My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	2.2
		One-Year	12.1*
		Three-Year	17.4*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-2.2
		One-Year	9.9*
		Three-Year	15.3*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-12.1*
		Post Survey	-9.9*
		Three-Year	5.4
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-17.4*
		Post Survey	-15.3*
		One-Year	-5.4
Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	2.9
		One-Year	10.1*
		Three-Year	13.7*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-2.9
		One-Year	7.2
		Three-Year	10.8*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-10.1*
		Post Survey	-7.2
		Three-Year	3.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-13.7*
		Post Survey	-10.8*
		One-Year	-3.6

My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	4.7
		One-Year	10.4*
		Three-Year	15.7*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-4.7
		One-Year	5.7
		Three-Year	11.0*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-10.4*
		Post Survey	-5.7
		Three-Year	5.3
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-15.7*
		Post Survey	-11.0*
		One-Year	-5.3
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.			

Figure 11

Mean Differences on Items Related to Incidents Involving Behavioral Crisis

Scale	Data over time	Nature of change, Pre- to Post-BLEA	Was the change (or level) sustained over time?	Statistical evidence of sustained change (or level)
Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work.		Increased	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous.		Increased	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.		Increased	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA

I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.		Increased	Not sustained	Post-BLEA higher, but one- and three-year not different than pre-BLEA
My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.		No change	Declined from post-BLEA to 3-year	Pre- and Post-BLEA not different, but one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.		No change	Declined from post-BLEA to 3-year	Pre- and Post-BLEA not different, but one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.		No change	Declined from post-BLEA to 3-year	Pre- and Post-BLEA not different, but one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA

Finally, we examined group differences in responses to the three scenarios. Results from the ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests for the first scenario (Depression) are summarized in Tables 6 and 7, below. As can be seen, officers correctly and consistently associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression at all four points of measurement. There was an increase in average pre- to post-test ratings on the item related to no increased risk of attempted suicide, but the 1- and 3-year averages were not significantly different from the pre-test level, and there was no difference in averages for the item related to increased risk of suicide-by-cop at all four points of measurement.

Officers identified the need to assess the subject's mental state as the first priority at all four points of measurement (with the 3-year follow-up significantly higher than the pre-test level). Gaining entry to secure weapons and restrain the subject was identified as a secondary priority (and there was an average decrease on this item from pre-test to three-year follow-up). A substantial decrease of about 32 points was observed in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"In speaking with Mr. N,*

it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself," And this decrease was sustained to the three-year follow-up measurement. There was also a decrease in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face"* although the one- and three-year scores were not significantly different from the pre-test level. Finally, respondents in all groups strongly endorsed the item, *"Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone"* with a significant increase from pre- to post-test. Figure 12 highlights the change in items for the Depression scenario.

Table 6
ANOVA Results Comparing Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Groups on Scenario 1 –Depression Items
(group n's = 360, 394, 140, and 116 respectively)

Scenario 1 (Depression): You are dispatched to a residence with the following information. Mr. N is a 30 year old male. His wife states that he has locked himself in the garage and won't come out. Mr. N's wife called the police because she doesn't know what he is going to do in there and she is concerned for his well-being. Mr. N has been feeling unusually sad and miserable for the past few months. Even though he is tired all the time, he has had great difficulty sleeping. He hasn't been eating much and has lost weight. He couldn't keep his mind on his work and put off doing important client projects and as a result he was let go from his job today. The wife states she has also just discovered that he hasn't been paying household bills and she found a pile of collection letters and foreclosure warnings in his office.

		Group Statistics			F-tests		
Scale	**Group**	**Mean**	**SD.**		**F**	**df**	**Sig.**
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	Pre-test	8.0	15.3				
	Post-test	5.4	15.5		1.6	727	.180
	One-Year	5.5	12.8				
	Three-Year	6.5	14.6				
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Depression.	Pre-test	91.4	12.7				
	Post-test	93.0	14.0		2.6	919	.052
	One-Year	94.5	9.4				
	Three-Year	94.4	11.0				
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre-test	8.1	13.8				
	Post-test	6.9	16.5		0.3	700	.816
	One-Year	7.7	17.3				
	Three-Year	7.4	13.8				
You determine that there is no increased risk that Mr. N might attempt suicide.	Pre-test	10.5	23.5				
	Post-test	17.0	32.9		3.1	744	.026
	One-Year	15.7	27.2				
	Three-Year	10.3	21.7				
You determine that there is an increased risk that Mr. N might become aggressive and potentially attempt suicide-by-cop.	Pre-test	67.5	28.0				
	Post-test	70.0	29.4		0.5	902	.659
	One-Year	69.0	31.3				
	Three-Year	67.1	31.2				
Your first priority upon arriving would be to gain entry to the garage in order to secure any weapons and to restrain Mr. N for his own safety.	Pre-test	27.4	28.8				
	Post-test	23.2	30.4		4.6	792	.003
	One-Year	18.8	28.0				
	Three-Year	15.8	24.3				
Your first priority would be to attempt to engage with Mr. N through the garage door to assess the situation and his current mental state.	Pre-test	84.5	22.3				
	Post-test	81.0	27.2		2.5	905	.059
	One-Year	77.9	30.9				
	Three-Year	78.7	29.5				
	Pre-test	48.2	36.3				

In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself.	Post-test	15.9	31.1		54.5	800	<.001
	One-Year	20.1	33.4				
	Three-Year	19.2	31.2				
You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face.	Pre-test	83.8	21.7				
	Post-test	78.8	27.0		2.6	906	.053
	One-Year	83.5	25.2				
	Three-Year	82.5	28.2				
Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone.	Pre-test	85.3	23.0				
	Post-test	83.8	27.2		1.1	914	.363
	One-Year	87.8	21.3				
	Three-Year	87.3	22.1				

Table 7

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results For Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Group Scores on Scenario 1 Depression Items

Dependent Variable	***(I) Group***	***(J) Contrast Group***	***Mean Difference (I-J)***
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	2.7
		One-Year	2.5
		Three-Year	1.5
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-2.7
		One-Year	-0.2
		Three-Year	-1.1
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-2.5
		Post Survey	0.2
		Three-Year	-1.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-1.5
		Post Survey	1.1
		One-Year	1.0
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Depression.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-1.6
		One-Year	-3.1
		Three-Year	-3.0
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	1.6
		One-Year	-1.5
		Three-Year	-1.4
	One-Year	Pre Survey	3.1
		Post Survey	1.5
		Three-Year	0.1
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	3.0
		Post Survey	1.4
		One-Year	-0.1
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	1.3
		One-Year	0.4
		Three-Year	0.7
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-1.3
		One-Year	-0.9
		Three-Year	-0.5
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-0.4
		Post Survey	0.9

		Three-Year	0.3
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-0.7
		Post Survey	0.5
		One-Year	-0.3
You determine that there is no increased risk that Mr. N might attempt suicide.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-6.4*
		One-Year	-5.1
		Three-Year	0.3
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	6.4*
		One-Year	1.3
		Three-Year	6.7
	One-Year	Pre Survey	5.1
		Post Survey	-1.3
		Three-Year	5.4
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-0.3
		Post Survey	-6.7
		One-Year	-5.4
You determine that there is an increased risk that Mr. N might become aggressive and potentially attempt suicide-by-cop.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-2.5
		One-Year	-1.5
		Three-Year	0.4
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	2.5
		One-Year	1.1
		Three-Year	2.9
	One-Year	Pre Survey	1.5
		Post Survey	-1.1
		Three-Year	1.9
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-0.4
		Post Survey	-2.9
		One-Year	-1.9
Your first priority upon arriving would be to gain entry to the garage in order to secure any weapons and to restrain Mr. N for his own safety.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	4.2
		One-Year	8.6
		Three-Year	11.6*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-4.2
		One-Year	4.4
		Three-Year	7.4
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-8.6
		Post Survey	-4.4
		Three-Year	3.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-11.6*
		Post Survey	-7.4
		One-Year	-3.0
Your first priority would be to attempt to engage with Mr. N through the garage door to assess the situation and his current mental state.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	3.4
		One-Year	6.6
		Three-Year	5.7
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-3.4
		One-Year	3.2
		Three-Year	2.3
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-6.6
		Post Survey	-3.2
		Three-Year	-0.8

	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-5.7
		Post Survey	-2.3
		One-Year	0.8
In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	32.2*
		One-Year	28.1*
		Three-Year	29.0*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-32.2*
		One-Year	-4.2
		Three-Year	-3.2
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-28.1*
		Post Survey	4.2
		Three-Year	1.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-29.0*
		Post Survey	3.2
		One-Year	-1.0
You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	5.0*
		One-Year	0.3
		Three-Year	1.3
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-5.0*
		One-Year	-4.7
		Three-Year	-3.6
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-0.3
		Post Survey	4.7
		Three-Year	1.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-1.3
		Post Survey	3.6
		One-Year	-1.0
Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	1.5
		One-Year	-2.5
		Three-Year	-2.0
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-1.5
		One-Year	-4.0
		Three-Year	-3.6
	One-Year	Pre Survey	2.5
		Post Survey	4.0
		Three-Year	0.5
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	2.0
		Post Survey	3.6
		One-Year	-0.5
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.			

Figure 12
Summary of changes on Scenario 1 (Depression) items

Item	Data over time	Nature of change, Pre- to Post-BLEA	Was the change (or level) sustained over time?	Statistical evidence of sustained change (or level)

Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.		No change	No change	No significant differences
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Depression.		No change	No change	No significant differences
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.		No change	No change	No significant differences
You determine that there is no increased risk that Mr. N might attempt suicide.		Increased	No change	Post-BLEA significantly higher than pre-BLEA, but one- and three-year are not different
You determine that there is an increased risk that Mr. N might become aggressive and potentially attempt suicide-by-cop.		No change	No change	No significant differences

Your first priority upon arriving would be to gain entry to the garage in order to secure any weapons and to restrain Mr. N for his own safety.		No change	Decline from pre-BLEA to three-year	Three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
Your first priority would be to attempt to engage with Mr. N through the garage door to assess the situation and his current mental state.		No change	No change	No significant differences
In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself.		Declined	Decline sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one-, and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face.		Declined	No change	Post-BLEA significantly lower than pre-BLEA, but one- and three-year are not different
Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone.		No change	No change	No significant differences

Results from the ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests for the second scenario (Schizophrenia) are summarized in Tables 8 and 9, below. As can be seen, officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Schizophrenia at all four points of measurement, with the average ratings significantly higher for the post-test, as well as one- and three-year follow-up groups. There was a notable decrease of about 26-points in pre- to post-test averages on the item, *"In speaking with Ms. S, it*

is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her," and that decrease was sustained at the one- and three-year follow-ups. There was also a decrease in pre- to post-test averages on the item, *"If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her*," and an increase in averages on the item, *"Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation,"* both of which were sustained at the one- and three-year follow-ups. Figure 13 highlights the change in selected items from the Schizophrenia scenario.

Table 8
ANOVA Results Comparing Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Groups on Scenario 2 Schizophrenia Items (group n's = 360, 394, 140, and 116 respectively)

Scenario 2 (Schizophrenia): You and a partner are dispatched to an apartment residence with the following information. Building manager has called police because tenant Ms. S, age 23, has been throwing things against the walls and will not answer the door. Upon arrival at the building, you contact the manager, who informs you that Ms. S lives alone and is unemployed. Over the past several months, she has rarely been seen other than to occasionally look out her door. It is apparent that she has lost considerable weight and her appearance is disheveled and unclean. She rarely seems to go anywhere or see anyone. Neighbors have been complaining because they hear her walking around the room late at night and even though they know she is alone, they have heard her shouting and arguing as if someone else is in there. She has been heard yelling about people spying on her through the vents. The manager does not want her arrested, but wants her to quiet down.

		Group Statistics			F-tests		
Scale	**Group**	**Mean**	**SD**		**F**	**df**	**Sig.**
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	Pre-test	22.0	23.9				
	Post-test	14.2	22.6		5.9	736	.001
	One-year	17.2	22.6				
	Three-year	14.7	20.9				
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with depression.	Pre-test	25.5	27.5				
	Post-test	11.7	20.8		18.8	744	<.001
	One-year	13.0	19.6				
	Three-year	13.0	21.2				
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre-test	80.9	24.5				
	Post-test	85.8	22.7		8.0	906	<.001
	One-year	91.5	13.0				
	Three-year	88.6	18.2				
The voices Ms. S hears in her head suggest she is experiencing hallucinations.	Pre-test	77.2	25.0				
	Post-test	76.1	30.4		5.3	894	.001
	One-year	81.7	27.6				
	Three-year	87.7	18.2				
Ms. S' belief that people are spying on her through the air vents suggest she is experiencing delusions.	Pre-test	78.7	23.9				
	Post-test	82.9	24.6		8.1	896	<.001
	One-year	87.9	20.4				
	Three-year	89.8	17.1				
In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her.	Pre-test	54.8	37.2				
	Post-test	29.1	36.6		36.2	822	<.001
	One-year	28.0	37.1				
	Three-year	23.0	32.4				
In speaking with Ms. S, you should keep a safe distance physically and emotionally, keeping a blade stance and informing her what you are doing there and why.	Pre-test	76.2	27.2				
	Post-test	80.5	28.0		4.1	884	.007
	One-year	78.7	28.5				
	Three-year	69.4	32.6				
	Pre-test	20.8	28.6				
	Post-test	9.3	22.5		13.0	754	<.001

If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her.	One-year	11.2	24.6				
	Three-year	7.6	16.7				
Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation.	Pre-test	70.3	28.2				
	Post-test	84.1	22.3		23.6	898	<.001
	One-year	86.9	20.2				
	Three-year	82.5	23.6				
You determine that Ms. S is not an imminent danger to herself or others and call the Mobile Crisis Team (MCT) to respond to do a mental health evaluation.	Pre-test	82.8	24.5				
	Post-test	77.1	32.1		4.9	886	.002
	One-year	87.4	23.6				
	Three-year	83.9	27.0				

Table 9

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results for Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Group Scores on Scenario 2 Schizophrenia Items

Dependent Variable	***(I) Group***	***(J) Contrast Group***	***Mean Difference (I-J)***
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	Pre Survey	Post Survey	7.8*
		One-Year	4.8
		Three-Year	7.2
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-7.8*
		One-Year	-3.0
		Three-Year	-0.5
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-4.8
		Post Survey	3.0
		Three-Year	2.5
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-7.2
		Post Survey	0.5
		One-Year	-2.5
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with depression.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	13.7*
		One-Year	12.5*
		Three-Year	12.5*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-13.7*
		One-Year	-1.3
		Three-Year	-1.3
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-12.5*
		Post Survey	1.3
		Three-Year	0.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-12.5*
		Post Survey	1.3
		One-Year	0.0
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-4.9*
		One-Year	-10.6*
		Three-Year	-7.7*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	4.9*
		One-Year	-5.7
		Three-Year	-2.8
	One-Year	Pre Survey	10.6*
		Post Survey	5.7
		Three-Year	2.9
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	7.7*
		Post Survey	2.8

		One-Year	-2.9
The voices Ms. S hears in her head suggest she is experiencing hallucinations.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	1.1
		One-Year	-4.5
		Three-Year	-10.5*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-1.1
		One-Year	-5.6
		Three-Year	-11.6*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	4.5
		Post Survey	5.6
		Three-Year	-6.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	10.5*
		Post Survey	11.6*
		One-Year	6.0
Ms. S' belief that people are spying on her through the air vents suggest she is experiencing delusions.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-4.2
		One-Year	-9.2*
		Three-Year	-11.0*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	4.2
		One-Year	-5.0
		Three-Year	-6.9
	One-Year	Pre Survey	9.2*
		Post Survey	5.0
		Three-Year	-1.9
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	11.0*
		Post Survey	6.9
		One-Year	1.9
In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	25.7*
		One-Year	26.8*
		Three-Year	31.7*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-25.7*
		One-Year	1.1
		Three-Year	6.1
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-26.8*
		Post Survey	-1.1
		Three-Year	4.9
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-31.7*
		Post Survey	-6.1
		One-Year	-4.9
In speaking with Ms. S, you should keep a safe distance physically and emotionally, keeping a blade stance and informing her what you are doing there and why.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-4.3
		One-Year	-2.5
		Three-Year	6.7
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	4.3
		One-Year	1.8
		Three-Year	11.1*
	One-Year	Pre Survey	2.5
		Post Survey	-1.8
		Three-Year	9.3
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-6.7
		Post Survey	-11.1*
		One-Year	-9.3
	Pre Survey	Post Survey	11.5*
		One-Year	9.6*

If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her.		Three-Year	13.2*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-11.5*
		One-Year	-1.9
		Three-Year	1.8
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-9.6*
		Post Survey	1.9
		Three-Year	3.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-13.2*
		Post Survey	-1.8
		One-Year	-3.6
Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-13.8*
		One-Year	-16.7*
		Three-Year	-12.2*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	13.8*
		One-Year	-2.8
		Three-Year	1.6
	One-Year	Pre Survey	16.7*
		Post Survey	2.8
		Three-Year	4.4
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	12.2*
		Post Survey	-1.6
		One-Year	-4.4
You determine that Ms. S is not an imminent danger to herself or others and call the Mobile Crisis Team (MCT) to respond to do a mental health evaluation.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	5.7*
		One-Year	-4.6
		Three-Year	-1.1
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-5.7*
		One-Year	-10.3*
		Three-Year	-6.8
	One-Year	Pre Survey	4.6
		Post Survey	10.3*
		Three-Year	3.5
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	1.1
		Post Survey	6.8
		One-Year	-3.5
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.			

Figure 13

Summary of changes on Scenario 2 (Schizophrenia) items

Item	Data over time	Nature of change, Pre- to Post-BLEA	Was the change (or level) sustained over time?	Statistical evidence of sustained change (or level)

Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).		Decrease	No change	One- and three-year not different than Pre- or Post-BLEA
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with depression.		Decrease	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with Schizophrenia.		Increase	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
The voices Ms. S hears in her head suggest she is experiencing hallucinations.		No change	Increase at three-year	Three-year significantly higher than Pre- and Post-BLEA
Ms. S' belief that people are spying on her through the air vents suggest she is experiencing delusions.		No change	Increase at one- and three-year	One- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA

In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her.		Decrease	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
In speaking with Ms. S, you should keep a safe distance physically and emotionally, keeping a blade stance and informing her what you are doing there and why.		No change	Decrease at three-year	Three-year significantly lower than Post-BLEA
If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her.		Decrease	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation.		Increase	Sustained to three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
You determine that Ms. S is not an imminent danger to herself or others and call the Mobile Crisis Team (MCT) to respond to do a mental health evaluation.		Decrease	Mixed	One-year significantly higher than Post-BLEA but not different than other groups

Results from the ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests for the third scenario (Dementia or Alzheimer's) are presented in Tables 10 and 11, below. As can be seen, officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Dementia or Alzheimer's at all four points of measurement, with the average rating at one-year significantly higher than the pre-test group. There was

a decrease in pre- to post-test scores on the item, *"You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave,"* instead favoring more comprehensive responses such as recognizing the need for outside help including friends or family members, and calling a Geriatric Regional Assessment Team (GRAT) or Mobile Crisis Team (MCT). Figure 14 highlights the change in items for the Dementia or Alzheimer's scenario.

Table 10

ANOVA Results Comparing Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Groups on Scenario 3 Dementia/Alzheimer's Items (group n's = 360, 394, 140, and 116 respectively)

Scenario 3 (Dementia or Alzheimer's): You are dispatched to a residence with the following information. Mr. B is an 88 year old male who has called police to report that his home has been burglarized. When you arrive at the residence, Mr. B lets you in and you can't help but notice that his clothing is stained and smells of urine. Walking through the kitchen, you see spoiled food on the counter and there are numerous empty alcohol bottles and broken glass on the floor and the gas stove burner is on. The living room is cluttered with piles of papers. It seems evident that there is no one else living there. When you ask Mr. B what was stolen from his home, he grows confused and says, "Nothing was stolen, why would anything be stolen?" You tell him that you are at his house because he called to report a burglary, but he denies doing this.

		Group Statistics			*F-tests*		
Scale	***Group***	***Mean***	***SD***		***F***	***df***	***Sig.***
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	Pre-test	12.4	19.2				
	Post-test	6.8	15.5		6.0	690	<.001
	One-Year	6.2	12.4				
	Three-Year	8.5	16.0				
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	Pre-test	90.4	17.7				
	Post-test	92.7	17.1		3.9	904	.009
	One-Year	95.6	8.9				
	Three-Year	94.8	10.4				
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre-test	19.3	26.4				
	Post-test	12.1	21.5		6.5	709	<.001
	One-Year	10.0	17.2				
	Three-Year	11.9	20.4				
You ask Mr. B if you can sit down and ask permission before moving any items.	Pre-test	65.3	36.2				
	Post-test	67.8	37.6		1.9	843	.127
	One-Year	74.8	34.7				
	Three-Year	70.7	32.5				
You engage Mr. B in conversation, asking short questions to ascertain if he is oriented to time, place, and person.	Pre-test	88.9	16.0				
	Post-test	92.2	15.2		4.5	902	.004
	One-Year	92.1	13.7				
	Three-Year	93.7	9.8				
Paraphrasing Mr. B's statements help to confirm that you understand them.	Pre-test	83.8	19.3				
	Post-test	89.4	18.3		7.4	891	<.001
	One-Year	88.9	17.0				
	Three-Year	90.6	12.5				
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave.	Pre-test	23.2	29.6				
	Post-test	13.1	24.9		7.7	759	<.001
	One-Year	14.3	26.2				
	Three-Year	15.2	23.3				
You determine that most likely has been no burglary, and you arrest Mr. B for filing a false report.	Pre-test	4.8	13.6				
	Post-test	3.2	12.0		1.5	677	.215
	One-Year	2.0	4.8				
	Three-Year	3.0	9.3				
	Pre-test	91.8	14.0				

You determine that most likely there has been no burglary, but Mr. B may need some outside help. You ask him if there is a friend or family member you can call for him.	Post-test	91.2	19.9		0.8	893	.480
	One-Year	93.5	14.7				
	Three-Year	89.9	19.1				
You call GRAT (Geriatric Regional Assessment Team) or MCT (Mobile Crisis Team) to see if they are available to do an evaluation.	Pre-test	86.3	21.4				
	Post-test	89.2	20.7		1.7	886	.160
	One-Year	90.7	22.8				
	Three-Year	89.1	21.0				

Table 11

Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Test Results For Pre-Test, Post-Test, One-Year, and Three-Year Group Scores on Scenario 3 Dementia/Alzheimer's Items

Dependent Variable	***(I) Group***	***(J) Contrast Group***	***Mean Difference (I-J)***
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	Pre Survey	Post Survey	5.6*
		One-Year	6.2*
		Three-Year	3.9
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-5.6*
		One-Year	0.6
		Three-Year	-1.7
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-6.2*
		Post Survey	-0.6
		Three-Year	-2.3
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-3.9
		Post Survey	1.7
		Three-Year	2.3
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-2.3
		One-Year	-5.1*
		Three-Year	-4.3
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	2.3
		One-Year	-2.8
		Three-Year	-2.0
	One-Year	Pre Survey	5.1*
		Post Survey	2.8
		Three-Year	0.8
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	4.3
		Post Survey	2.0
		Three-Year	-0.8
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	7.3*
		One-Year	9.3*
		Three-Year	7.4
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-7.3*
		One-Year	2.1
		Three-Year	0.1
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-9.3*
		Post Survey	-2.1
		Three-Year	-2.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-7.4
		Post Survey	-0.1

		Three-Year	2.0
You ask Mr. B if you can sit down and ask permission before moving any items.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-2.5
		One-Year	-9.5
		Three-Year	-5.4
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	2.5
		One-Year	-7.0
		Three-Year	-2.9
	One-Year	Pre Survey	9.5
		Post Survey	7.0
		Three-Year	4.1
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	5.4
		Post Survey	2.9
		Three-Year	-4.1
You engage Mr. B in conversation, asking short questions to ascertain if he is oriented to time, place, and person.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-3.4*
		One-Year	-3.2
		Three-Year	-4.8*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	3.4*
		One-Year	0.1
		Three-Year	-1.4
	One-Year	Pre Survey	3.2
		Post Survey	-0.1
		Three-Year	-1.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	4.8*
		Post Survey	1.4
		Three-Year	1.6
Paraphrasing Mr. B's statements help to confirm that you understand them.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-5.7*
		One-Year	-5.2*
		Three-Year	-6.8*
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	5.7*
		One-Year	0.5
		Three-Year	-1.2
	One-Year	Pre Survey	5.2*
		Post Survey	-0.5
		Three-Year	-1.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	6.8*
		Post Survey	1.2
		Three-Year	1.6
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	10.1*
		One-Year	8.9*
		Three-Year	8.0
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-10.1*
		One-Year	-1.2
		Three-Year	-2.2
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-8.9*
		Post Survey	1.2
		Three-Year	-1.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-8.0
		Post Survey	2.2
		Three-Year	1.0

You determine that most likely has been no burglary, and you arrest Mr. B for filing a false report.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	1.6
		One-Year	2.8
		Three-Year	1.8
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-1.6
		One-Year	1.2
		Three-Year	0.2
	One-Year	Pre Survey	-2.8
		Post Survey	-1.2
		Three-Year	-1.0
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-1.8
		Post Survey	-0.2
		Three-Year	1.0
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary, but Mr. B may need some outside help. You ask him if there is a friend or family member you can call for him.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	0.6
		One-Year	-1.7
		Three-Year	1.9
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	-0.6
		One-Year	-2.3
		Three-Year	1.3
	One-Year	Pre Survey	1.7
		Post Survey	2.3
		Three-Year	3.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	-1.9
		Post Survey	-1.3
		Three-Year	-3.6
You call GRAT (Geriatric Regional Assessment Team) or MCT (Mobile Crisis Team) to see if they are available to do an evaluation.	Pre Survey	Post Survey	-2.9
		One-Year	-4.4
		Three-Year	-2.8
	Post Survey	Pre Survey	2.9
		One-Year	-1.5
		Three-Year	0.1
	One-Year	Pre Survey	4.4
		Post Survey	1.5
		Three-Year	1.6
	Three-Year	Pre Survey	2.8
		Post Survey	-0.1
		Three-Year	-1.6
* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.			

Figure 14

Summary of changes on Scenario 3 (Dementia or Alzheimer's) items

Item	Data over time	Nature of change, Pre- to Post-BLEA	Was the change (or level) sustained over time?	Statistical evidence of sustained change (or level)

Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).		Decrease	Sustained at one-year	Post-BLEA and one-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.		No change	Increase at one-year	One-year significantly higher than Pre-BLEA
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.		Decrease	Sustained at one-year	Post-BLEA and one-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
You ask Mr. B if you can sit down and ask permission before moving any items.		No change	No change	No significant differences
You engage Mr. B in conversation, asking short questions to ascertain if he is oriented to time, place, and person.		Increase	Sustained at three-year	Post-BLEA and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA

Paraphrasing Mr. B's statements help to confirm that you understand them.		Increase	Sustained at one- and three-year	Post-BLEA, one- and three-year significantly higher than pre-BLEA
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave.		Decrease	Sustained at one-year	Post-BLEA and one-year significantly lower than pre-BLEA
You determine that most likely has been no burglary, and you arrest Mr. B for filing a false report.		No change	No change	No significant differences
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary, but Mr. B may need some outside help. You ask him if there is a friend or family member you can call for him		No change	No change	No significant differences
You call GRAT (Geriatric Regional Assessment Team) or MCT (Mobile Crisis Team) to see if they are available to do an evaluation.		No change	No change	No significant differences

Within Individual Change

The ANOVA results presented above describe aggregate (group-level) change but may mask variability in individual change. Paired sample *t*-tests were conducted to examine within-individual change

among 228 recruits for whom pre- and post-test measures could be individually linked.[6] Within this sample of 228 officers, 11% are female, 21% are nonwhite, and 62% have a college degree. Table 12 shows the demographic characteristics of the 228 recruits included in the within individual change analysis.

Table 12
Background Characteristics of Within-Individual Sample (n=228)

	n (%)	***M(SD)***
Gender (n=227)		
Female	24 (10.6)	---
Male	203 (89.4)	---
Age (n=228)		
	---	28.7 (6.0)
Total Years in Law Enforcement (n=223)		
	---	1.1 (2.6)
Race/Ethnicity (n=227)		
Caucasian	178 (78.4)	---
African-American	4 (1.8)	---
Latino/Latina or Hispanic	23 (10.1)	---
Asian/Pacific Islander	10 (4.4)	---
Native-American/Alaskan Native	0 (0.0)	---
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	10 (4.4)	---
Other	2 (0.9)	---
Education (n=226)		
HS/GED	18 (8.0)	---
Some College	67 (29.6)	---
AA/AS	43 (19.0)	---
BA/BS	92 (40.7)	---
MA/MS	6 (2.7)	---
Current Rank (n=222)		
Recruit	182 (82.0)	---
Officer	18 (8.1)	---
Student officer in field training	14 (6.3)	---
Other	8 (3.6)	

Z-tests for the difference in proportions show that these demographics are not statistically different from those of the larger pre-test group (z = -0.4, p = .682; z = -0.6, p = .555; and z = 0.1, p = .920,

[6] The sample of participants who could be individually matched at the pre/post/1-year/3-year data collection points was too small to include in the within-individual analysis. Thus, only pre/post within-individual results are presented here to supplement the between-subjects pre/post/1-year/3-year longitudinal findings.

respectively). In addition, the average age is 28.7 years (*SD* = 6.0), and this is not statistically different from the larger pre-test group (*t* (584) = 0.4, *p* = .694).

Results from the paired t-tests examining scale scores are presented in Table 13, below, and Figure 15 depicts the mean scores graphically for each group. As can be seen, statistically significant changes were observed in four of the seven scales. Specifically, there was an average increase of about 6 points on the Burnout / Emotional Intelligence scale (*t* (218) = -9.0, *p* < .001); an average decrease of about 3 points on the Guardianship – Empathy scale (*t* (205) = 2.9, *p* = .005); an average increase of about 19 points on the CIT Support scale (*t* (117) = -8.0, *p* < .001); and an average increase of about 5 points on the CIT Organizational Value scale (*t* (171) = -2.5, *p* = .015). These results are largely consistent with the ANOVA findings (except for the Organizational Support scale for which an aggregate increase was observed in the ANOVA model, but with no corresponding within-individual change and the Guardianship-Empathy scale for which no aggregate change was observed in the ANOVA model but showed a within-individual decrease).

Table 13
Mean Differences On Pre- And Post-Test Scale Ratings (*n* = 228)

	Pre-test			***Post-test***					
Scale	***Mean***	***SD***		***Mean***	***SD***		***t***	***df***	***Sig.***
Burnout / Emotional Intelligence	84.2	10.9		90.5	8.2		-9.0	218	<.001
Negative Police Subculture	38.2	16.1		39.0	17.4		-0.6	147	.563
Organizational Support	76.3	13.9		76.2	12.2		0.05	170	.964
Guardianship / Empathy	84.1	12.9		81.2	14.1		2.9	205	.005
Guardianship / Respect	82.4	14.7		83.5	13.4		-1.2	220	.216
CIT Support	58.2	25.5		77.3	15.9		-8.0	117	<.001
CIT Organizational Value	78.6	24.7		83.7	20.1		-2.5	171	.015

Figure 15
Mean Differences on Scales for BLEA Pre/Post Paired Sample *t*-tests



The pre-test, post-test, and change scores (i.e., the post-test score minus the pre-test score) were treated as dependent variables in a series of OLS regression models, with independent variables including: officer gender, race, age, education, and years in law enforcement; and variables controlling for prior training on Blue Courage and CIT training. Results are presented for statistically significant models, based upon the results of model F-tests. One of the pre-test scale scores, two post-test scale scores, and one change score yielded statistically significant models.

Results for the pre-test CIT Support model are presented in Table 14, below. The pre-test model indicates that, while controlling for other variables in the model, officers with prior CIT training scored about 19 points lower on average on the pre-test CIT Support. The model explains about 16% of the variance in the pre-test CIT Support scale scores.

Table 14
OLS Regression Results For Pre-Test CIT Support Scale Ratings (*n* = 145)

Variable	***B***	***SE***	***b***	***t***	***Sig.***
Female	-.529	6.948	-.006	-.076	.939
Nonwhite	8.042	5.413	.119	1.486	.140
Age	-.239	.399	-.054	-.598	.551
College Degree	6.569	4.771	.114	1.377	.171
Years in Law Enforcement	1.462	.933	.147	1.568	.119
Prior BC training	12.977	7.997	.139	1.623	.107
Prior CIT training	19.349	5.988	.282	3.231	.002

Results for the post-test Negative Police Subculture model are presented in Table 15, below. The post-test model indicates that, while controlling for other variables in the model, officer race was positively associated with post-test scores on this scale. Specifically, nonwhite officers scored about 8 points higher on average on the post-test Negative Police Subculture scale. In addition, it should be noted that female officers scored about 8 points lower on average (p = .062) and officers having a college degree scored about 5 points higher on average (p = .059). The model explains about 13% of the variance in the post-test Negative Police Subculture scale scores.

Table 15
OLS Regression Results For Post-Test Negative Police Subculture Scale Ratings *(n* = 189)

Variable	***B***	***SE***	***b***	***t***	***Sig.***
Female	-8.213	4.366	-.131	-1.881	.062
Nonwhite	8.378	3.019	.197	2.775	.006
Age	.221	.224	.076	.985	.326
College Degree	4.795	2.526	.133	1.899	.059
Years in Law Enforcement	.847	.527	.130	1.605	.110
Prior BC training	5.605	4.864	.084	1.152	.251
Prior CIT training	3.150	3.712	.066	.848	.397

Results for the post-test Guardianship-Empathy model are presented in Table 16, below. The post-test model indicates that, while controlling for other variables in the model, female officers scored about 10 points higher on average. The model explains about 6% of the variance in the post-test Guardianship-Empathy scale scores.

Table 16 **OLS Regression Results for Post-Test Guardianship-Empathy Scale Ratings (*n* = 213)**					
Variable	***B***	***SE***	***b***	***t***	***Sig.***
Female	9.881	3.257	.209	3.034	.003
Nonwhite	1.967	2.397	.056	.821	.413
Age	.018	.184	.007	.096	.924
College Degree	2.851	2.038	.096	1.399	.163
Years in Law Enforcement	-.351	.422	-.064	-.830	.407
Prior BC training	3.953	3.836	.072	1.030	.304
Prior CIT training	2.363	2.941	.059	.804	.423

The model predicting change from pre- to post-test scores on the Negative Police Subculture scale are presented in Table 17, below. The change model indicates that, while controlling for other variables in the model, officers with college degrees had an average 7-point higher change from pre- to post-test measurement on the Negative Police Subculture scale. The model explains about 10% of the variance in the Negative Police Subculture scale change scores.

Table 17 **OLS Regression Results For Change in Negative Police Subculture Scale Ratings (*n* = 143)**					
Variable	*B*	*SE*	*b*	*t*	*Sig.*
Female	-8.513	5.132	-.136	-1.659	.099
Nonwhite	2.206	3.459	.053	.638	.525
Age	-.222	.275	-.074	-.810	.419
College Degree	6.852	3.052	.188	2.245	.026
Years in Law Enforcement	.843	.642	.128	1.313	.191
Prior BC training	9.611	5.892	.147	1.631	.105
Prior CIT training	4.191	4.524	.092	.926	.356

We next examined individual change in responses to the behavioral crisis items. Results from paired *t*-tests are presented in Table 18, below, and Figure 16 depicts selected mean scores graphically for each group. As can be seen, statistically significant changes were observed in all but one of the seven items. Specifically, there was an average increase of about 5- and 7-points, respectively, on the first two items, "*Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work*" and "*Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous*" (t (222) = -3.3, p = .001; t (220) = -4.2, p<.001), and an average increase of about 7-points on the item, "*I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis*" (t (224) = -4.7, p < .001). There was an average decrease of about 7-points on the item, "*My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*" (t (199) = 2.9, p = .005), and an average decrease of about 5- and 6-points, respectively, on the last two items, "*Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*" and "*My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*" (t (193) = 2.2, p = .031; t (186) = 2.7, p = .007). There was no statistically significant change in the item, "*I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events*" (t (189) = -0.9, p = .372). These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings (except for the fourth item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events,"* that exhibited no change within-individuals but an was increase observed in the ANOVA model between pre- and post-test.

Table 18
Mean Differences On Pre- and Post-Test Behavioral Crisis Items (*n* = 225)

	Pre-test			*Post-test*				
Item	***Mean***	***SD***		***Mean***	***SD***		***T***	***Sig.***
Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work.	79.2	20.3		84.0	16.4		-3.3	.001
Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous.	72.2	22.0		79.3	19.3		-4.2	<.001
I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.	73.6	22.7		81.0	17.0		-4.7	<.001
I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.	63.0	27.4		65.2	27.9		-0.9	.372
My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	68.4	28.6		61.9	27.7		2.9	.005
Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	62.2	27.0		57.4	26.5		2.2	.031
My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.	62.1	27.5		55.7	27.2		2.7	.007

Figure 16
Selected Items - Behavioral Crisis BLEA Pre/Post



Finally, we examined individual change in responses to the three scenarios. Results from paired *t*-tests for the first scenario (Depression) are presented in Table 19, below, and Figure 17 depicts selected mean scores graphically for each group. As can be seen, officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a small but statistically significant increase (t (215) = -2.3, p = .025). There was also an average decrease in scores associating symptoms with Dementia or Alzheimer's (t (146) = 2.5, p = .012), although these ratings were relatively low to begin with. There was an average increase of about 9-points on the item related to no increased risk of attempted suicide (t (149) = -2.8, p = .005), and an average increase of about 5-points on the item related to increased risk of suicide-by-cop (t (202) = -1.9, p = .053). Officers identified the need to assess the subject's mental state as the first priority in both pre- and post-test responses (with no statistically significant difference) and gaining entry to secure weapons and restrain the subject as a secondary priority (with no statistically significant difference from pre- to post-test). A substantial decrease of about 32-points on average was observed with regard to the item, *"In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself"* (t (170) = 9.2, p < .001). These results are largely consistent with the ANOVA findings.

Table 19

Mean Differences On Pre- And Post-Test Responses, Scenario 1 Depression (*n* = 216)

Scenario 1 (Depression): You are dispatched to a residence with the following information. Mr. N is a 30 year old male. His wife states that he has locked himself in the garage and won't come out. Mr. N's wife called the police because she doesn't know what he is going to do in there and she is concerned for his well-being. Mr. N has been feeling unusually sad and miserable for the past few months. Even though he is tired all the time, he has had great difficulty sleeping. He hasn't been eating much and has lost weight. He couldn't keep his mind on his work and put off doing important client projects and as a result he was let go from his job today. The wife states she has also just discovered that he hasn't been paying household bills and she found a pile of collection letters and foreclosure warnings in his office.

	Pre-test			***Post-test***				
Item	***Mean***	***SD.***		***Mean***	***SD.***		***T***	***Sig.***
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	8.2	14.8		5.3	14.7		2.5	.012
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Depression.	91.2	13.1		93.6	11.9		-2.3	.025
Mr. N is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	7.7	12.9		6.1	15.3		1.1	.274
You determine that there is no increased risk that Mr. N might attempt suicide.	8.7	21.9		17.6	33.3		-2.8	.005
You determine that there is an increased risk that Mr. N might become aggressive and potentially attempt suicide-by-cop.	67.6	26.8		72.1	28.4		-1.9	.053
Your first priority upon arriving would be to gain entry to the garage in order to secure any weapons and to restrain Mr. N for his own safety.	28.2	27.4		23.6	30.2		1.8	.071
Your first priority would be to attempt to engage with Mr. N through the garage door to assess the situation and his current mental state.	84.1	20.7		80.8	26.5		1.6	.103
In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself.	47.6	36.0		15.7	30.6		9.2	<.001
You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face.	84.1	21.4		79.3	26.3		2.3	.024

Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24 hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone.	84.7	24.1		83.1	28.0		0.7	.478

Figure 17
Selected Items Scenario 1 - Depression BLEA Pre/Post



Results from paired sample *t*-tests for the second scenario (Schizophrenia) are presented in Table 20, below, and selected items are presented graphically in Figure 18. As can be seen, officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Schizophrenia in both their pre- and post-test responses, with no statistically significant difference. There was also an average decrease of about 6 and 13 points, respectively, in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Depression (t (153) = 2.6, p = .010; t (157) = 6.1, p < .001). Notably, there was a substantial average decrease of about 25 points on the item, “In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her” (t (182) = 7.5, p < .001). There was also an average decrease of about 13 points on the item, “If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her” (t (158) = 5.2, p < .001), and an average increase of about 12 points on the item, “Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation” (t (206) = -5.1, p < .001). These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings.

Table 20

Mean Differences On Pre- And Post-Test Responses, Scenario 2 Schizophrenia (*n* = 698)

Scenario 2 (Schizophrenia): You and a partner are dispatched to an apartment residence with the following information. Building manager has called police because tenant Ms. S, age 23, has been throwing things against the walls and will not answer the door. Upon arrival at the building, you contact the manager, who informs you that Ms. S lives alone and is unemployed. Over the past several months, she has rarely been seen other than to occasionally look out her door. It is apparent that she has lost considerable weight and her appearance is disheveled and unclean. She rarely seems to go anywhere or see anyone. Neighbors have been complaining because they hear her walking around the room late at night and even though they know she is alone, they have heard her shouting and arguing as if someone else is in there. She has been heard yelling about people spying on her through the vents. The manager does not want her arrested, but wants her to quiet down.

	Pre-test			*Post-test*				
Item	*Mean*	*SD.*		*Mean*	*SD.*		*T*	*Sig.*
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	21.9	22.9		16.4	24.4		2.6	.010
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with depression.	25.4	26.3		12.3	20.8		6.1	<.001
Ms. S is exhibiting symptoms associated with Schizophrenia.	82.2	22.4		85.3	22.4		-1.7	.095
The voices Ms. S hears in her head suggest she is experiencing hallucinations.	77.4	24.3		79.3	27.5		-0.8	.403
Ms. S' belief that people are spying on her through the air vents suggest she is experiencing delusions.	79.0	24.2		83.2	23.9		-2.1	.038
In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her.	53.6	36.1		28.9	36.8		7.5	<.001
In speaking with Ms. S, you should keep a safe distance physically and emotionally, keeping a blade stance and informing her what you are doing there and why.	75.0	27.0		79.0	29.7		-1.6	.121
If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her.	22.3	29.4		9.3	22.1		5.2	<.001
Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation.	70.2	28.6		82.1	23.7		-5.1	<.001
You determine that Ms. S is not an imminent danger to herself or others and call the Mobile Crisis Team (MCT) to respond to do a mental health evaluation.	82.5	24.5		77.9	31.7		1.9	.062

Figure 18
Selected Items Scenario 2 - Schizophrenia BLEA Pre/Post



Results from paired sample *t*-tests for the third scenario (Dementia or Alzheimer's) are presented in Table 21, below, and selected items are presented graphically in Figure 19. As can be seen, officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Dementia or Alzheimer's in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a significant increase from pre- to post-test (t (207) = -2.1, p = .037). There were decreases in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Schizophrenia (t (133) = 2.8, p = .007; t (144) = 3.9, p < .001). Notably, there was an average decrease of about 10-points on the item, "You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave" (t (160) = 4.2, p < .001), instead favoring more comprehensive responses such as recognizing the need for outside help including friends or family members, and calling a Geriatric Regional Assessment Team (GRAT) or Mobile Crisis Team (MCT). These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings.

Table 21
Mean Differences On Pre- And Post-Test Responses, Scenario 3 Dementia/Alzheimer's (*n* = 209)

Scenario 3 (Dementia or Alzheimer's): You are dispatched to a residence with the following information. Mr. B is an 88 year old male who has called police to report that his home has been burglarized. When you arrive at the residence, Mr. B lets you in and you can't help but notice that his clothing is stained and smells of urine. Walking through the kitchen, you see spoiled food on the counter and there are numerous empty alcohol bottles and broken glass on the floor and the gas stove burner is on. The living room is cluttered with piles of papers. It seems evident that there is no one else living there. When you ask Mr. B what was stolen from his home, he grows confused and says, "Nothing was stolen, why would anything be stolen?" You tell him that you are at his house because he called to report a burglary, but he denies doing this.

	Pre-test			***Post-test***				
Item	***Mean***	***SD***		***Mean***	***SD***		***T***	***Sig.***
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).	13.8	18.9		9.1	18.1		2.8	.007
Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Dementia or Alzheimer's.	90.3	18.4		93.4	14.1		-2.1	.037

Mr. B is exhibiting symptoms most associated with Schizophrenia.	21.6	27.5		12.7	21.4		3.9	.000
You ask Mr. B if you can sit down and ask permission before moving any items.	64.6	37.2		66.0	38.0		-0.4	.673
You engage Mr. B in conversation, asking short questions to ascertain if he is oriented to time, place, and person.	88.9	14.7		92.0	14.1		-2.8	.006
Paraphrasing Mr. B's statements help to confirm that you understand them.	83.0	20.2		88.2	18.9		-3.0	.003
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave.	22.9	28.4		13.1	24.7		4.2	.000
You determine that most likely has been no burglary, and you arrest Mr. B for filing a false report.	3.9	11.1		2.6	9.6		1.5	.147
You determine that most likely there has been no burglary, but Mr. B may need some outside help. You ask him if there is a friend or family member you can call for him.	92.4	12.5		91.9	17.9		0.4	.690
You call GRAT (Geriatric Regional Assessment Team) or MCT (Mobile Crisis Team) to see if they are available to do an evaluation.	86.3	20.3		88.0	22.0		-0.9	.352

Figure 19
Selected Items Scenario 3 – Alzheimer's/Dementia BLEA Pre/Post



Self-Report Psychopathy (SRP-SF) Scale

The SRP-SF was included in the survey instrument as a measure of officer personality to examine the relationship between officer personality characteristics associated with the construct of

psychopathy and officer demographic characteristics as independent variables and officer ratings on the dependent variable scale ratings on the 7 scales employed to measure the effect of the guardian-training: 1) Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, 2) Negative Police Subculture, 3) Organizational Support, 4) Guardianship/Respect, 5) Guardianship/Empathy, 6) CIT Support, and 7) CIT Organizational Value. For this analysis, we expand on previous work that was reported on in the Phase 2 final report. In that earlier work, we linked pre- and post-test surveys for 364 respondents and examined the univariate distribution of SRP-SF total and subscale scores, bivariate relationships with demographic data and scores on the other training scales, and multivariate models treating the training scale scores (pre-, post-, and change) as dependent variables. In brief, we found that the SRP-SF total score was a significant predictor of pre-, post-, and change scores for the Negative Police Subculture scale, as well as the post-test score for the Guardianship–Empathy scale and the pre-test score for the Guardianship–Respect scale. Here, we are extending the analysis by examining a subset of 58 respondents for whom pre-, post-, and one-year follow-up survey responses could be linked.[7] Background characteristics of the BLEA recruits who completed all three surveys are presented in Table 22.

Table 22
Background Characteristics of Pre-, Post-, and One-Year Respondents (*n*=58)

	***n* (%)**	***M*(*SD*)**
Gender		
Female	6 (10.3)	---
Male	52 (89.7)	---
Age		
	---	29.0 (5.3)
Total Years in Law Enforcement		
	---	1.5 (3.5)
Race/Ethnicity		
Caucasian	45 (77.6)	---
African-American	1 (1.7)	---
Latino/Latina or Hispanic	2 (3.4)	---
Asian/Pacific Islander	4 (6.9)	---
Native-American/Alaskan Native	0 (0.0)	---
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	5 (8.6)	---
Other	1 (1.7)	---
Education		
HS/GED	4 (6.9)	---
Some College	20 (34.5)	---
AA/AS	10 (17.2)	---
BA/BS	24 (41.4)	---
JD	0 (0.0)	---
MA/MS	0 (0.0)	---

[7] We were not able to extend this analysis to four waves because the number of competed pre/post/1-year/3-year surveys that could be linked was too small at this stage of the longitudinal follow-up for meaningful statistical analysis.

Current Rank		
Recruit	45 (77.6)	---
Officer	5 (8.6)	---
Student officer in field training	5 (8.6)	---
Other	3 (5.2)	

Table 23 presents descriptive statistics for the pre-test SRP total and subscale scores. As can be seen, the mean score on the total was 45.3 (*SD* = 8.9) with a minimum score of 31 and a maximum of 76. The mean Interpersonal score was 9.9 (*SD* = 2.8), with a minimum score of 7 and a maximum of 19. The mean Affective score was 12.2 (*SD* = 3.6), with a minimum score of 7 and a maximum of 22. The mean Lifestyle score was 11.1 (*SD* = 2.9), with a minimum score of 7 and a maximum of 18. The mean Antisocial score was 12.1 (*SD* = 2.7), with a minimum score of 8 and a maximum of 19. The mean Factor 1 score was 22.0 (*SD* = 5.7), with a minimum score of 14 and a maximum of 39. Finally, the mean Factor 2 score was 23.2 (*SD* = 4.6), with a minimum score of 15 and a maximum of 37. The scores for the Total, Interpersonal, Lifestyle, Factor 1, and Factor 2 subscales are slightly lower, and the scores for the Affective and Antisocial subscales are slightly higher, than those reported for a community reference sample in Paulhaus et al., (2016).

Table 23
Pre-BLEA scores on SRP-SF and Subscales (*n*=58)

Statistic	Total	Inter-personal	Affective	Lifestyle	Anti-social	Factor 1	Factor 2
Mean	45.3	9.9	12.2	11.1	12.1	22.0	23.2
St Dev	8.9	2.8	3.6	2.9	2.7	5.7	4.6
Median	44.0	9.0	12.0	11.0	12.0	21.0	22.0
Minimum	31.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	8.0	14.0	15.0
Maximum	76.0	19.0	22.0	18.0	19.0	39.0	37.0
25th %-ile	39.5	7.0	10.0	9.0	11.0	18.75	20.0
75th %-ile	50.25	12.0	14.0	13.25	13.25	25.25	26.0

To explore the stability of the SRP scale over three waves, we calculated correlations between the pre-BLEA, post-BLEA, and the one-year follow-up SRP totals. Figure 20 displays scatterplots between the SRP totals that were observed within the same individuals at these three points of measurement. Pearson's r is equal to .66 ($p < .001$) for the pre- and post-BLEA waves, .67 ($p < .001$) for the pre-BLEA and one-year follow-up waves, and .82 ($p < .001$) for the post-BLEA and one-year follow-up waves.

Figure 20
Scatterplots of Pre-BLEA, Post-BLEA, and One-Year Follow-up SRP-SF Totals


Scatterplot of PRE SRP Total by POST SRP Total (r = .66, p < .001, n = 58)
POST SRP Total
80.00
70.00
60.00
50.00
40.00
30.00
20.00
20.00
30.00
40.00
50.00
60.00
70.00
80.00
PRE SRP Total


Scatterplot of PRE SRP Total by ONE YEAR SRP Total (r = .67, p < .001, n = 45)
ONE YEAR SRP Total
80.00
70.00
60.00
50.00
40.00
30.00
20.00
20.00
30.00
40.00
50.00
60.00
70.00
80.00
PRE SRP Total



We next explored the correlations among the various SRP-SF scale scores and the other survey scales related to Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Negative Police Subculture, Organizational Support, Guardianship Empathy, Guardianship Respect, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value (see Table 24). The SRP-SF Affective subscale is significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Burnout / Emotional Intelligence scale at both the post-BLEA (Pearson's *r* = -.274) and one-year (*r* = -.362) measurements, as is the Factor 1 score at one-year (*r* = -.295). That is, individuals who scored higher on the affective subscale tended also to score lower on the Burnout / Emotional Intelligence scale.

The SRP-SF total and lifestyle subscale are significantly and positively correlated with scores on the Negative Police Subculture scale at both pre-BLEA (*r* = .330 and .411, respectively) and one-year (*r* = .311 and .401, respectively) measurements. The Factor 2 score is also significantly and positively correlated with scores at the one-year point (*r* = .314). That is, individuals who scored higher on the SRP-SF total, and the lifestyle and factor 2 subscale, tended also to score higher on the Negative Police Subculture scale at these points in time.

The SRP-SF interpersonal and Factor 1 subscales are significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Guardianship Empathy scale at pre-BLEA (*r* = -.360 and -.295, respectively). That is, individuals who scored higher on the interpersonal and factor 1 subscales tended also to score lower on the guardianship empathy scale at pre-BLEA.

The SRP-SF total and all subscales, except the antisocial and factor 2 subscales, are significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the guardianship respect scale at pre-BLEA. The total and all subscales, except the interpersonal and antisocial subscales, are also significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the guardianship respect scale at the one-year follow-up (correlations range from -.262 to -.423). That is, individuals who scored higher on the SRP-SF total and the above mentioned SRP-SF subscales, tended also to score lower on the guardianship respect scale.

Finally, the SRP-SF interpersonal, affective, and factor 1 subscale scores were significantly and negatively correlated with the CIT Support scale at pre-BLEA (*r* = -.330, -.438, and -.446, respectively), indicating that individuals who scored higher on these SRP-SF subscales tended also to score lower on the CIT Support scale. The SRP-SF affective scale score was also significantly and negatively correlated

with the CIT Support scale at the one-year follow-up (r = -.308). Finally, the SRP-SF factor 2 subscale was significantly and positively correlated with the CIT Support scale at post-BLEA (r = .314).

Table 24

Correlations among pre-BLEA SRP-SF scales and other BLEA survey scales at pre-, post-, and one-year follow-up

		Pre-BLEA SRP-SF Scores						
		Total	Inter-personal	Affective	Life-style	Anti-social	Factor 1	Factor 2
Burnout / Emotional Intelligence	Pre-BLEA	-.040	-.012	-.075	.023	-.045	-.053	-.012
	Post-BLEA	-.164	-.143	-.274*	-.071	.049	-.243	-.016
	One-Year	-.164	-.135	-.362**	-.077	.166	-.295*	.048
Negative Police Subculture	Pre-BLEA	.330*	.300	.246	.411**	.082	.295	.284
	Post-BLEA	.242	.209	.174	.212	.134	.213	.206
	One-Year	.311*	.183	.207	.402**	.133	.223	.314*
Organizational Support	Pre-BLEA	-.015	-.190	-.036	.105	.090	-.117	.114
	Post-BLEA	-.091	-.127	-.063	-.044	-.038	-.104	-.049
	One-Year	.023	-.040	.048	.021	.030	.011	.030
Guardianship Empathy	Pre-BLEA	-.213	-.360**	-.185	-.009	-.069	-.295*	-.046
	Post-BLEA	-.117	.008	-.110	-.103	-.142	-.065	-.146
	One-Year	-.131	-.091	-.165	-.098	-.015	-.149	-.069
Guardianship Respect	Pre-BLEA	-.415**	-.400**	-.423**	-.262*	-.110	-.466**	-.224
	Post-BLEA	-.216	-.101	-.198	-.178	-.157	-.175	-.200
	One-Year	-.395**	-.189	-.354**	-.393**	-.225	-.317*	-.369**
CIT Support	Pre-BLEA	-.296	-.330*	-.438**	-.148	.046	-.446**	-.062
	Post-BLEA	.168	.082	-.048	.237	.275	.010	.314*
	One-Year	-.231	-.132	-.308*	-.112	-.116	-.261	-.131
CIT Organizational Value	Pre-BLEA	-.055	-.269	-.140	.078	.200	-.225	.161
	Post-BLEA	.020	.033	-.070	.037	.087	-.030	.073
	One-Year	-.246	-.145	-.178	-.203	-.206	-.187	-.242

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Finally, we explored the correlations among the various pre-BLEA SRP-SF scale scores and the change scores from pre- to post-BLEA survey scales related to Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Negative Police Subculture, Organizational Support, Guardianship Empathy, Guardianship Respect, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value, as well as the scores on these training scales at the one-year follow-up (see Table 25). There were only a handful of correlations with the changes scores. Notably, the SRP-SF interpersonal scale scores were significantly and positively correlated with the change in Guardianship Empathy, Guardianship Respect, and CIT Support scale scores for pre- to post-BLEA, indicating that higher scores on these SRP-SF scales were associated with higher change scores (where positive change values indicate increases from pre-to post- measurement). However, these correlations did not persist to change at the one-year follow-up. In addition, the SRP-SF Factor 1 subscale was significantly

and positively correlated with change in the CIT Support scale from pre- to post-BLEA. Finally, the SRP-SF antisocial and factor 2 subscales were significantly and negatively correlated with the change in the CIT Organizational Value scale scores from pre-BLEA to the one-year follow-up, indicating that higher scores on these SRP-SF subscales were associated with lower change scores on the CIT Organizational Value scale.

Table 25

Correlations among pre-BLEA SRP-SF scales and change in other scales pre- to post-BLEA and pre-BLEA to one-year

		SRP-SF Scores						
		Total	Inter-personal	Affective	Life-style	Anti-social	Factor 1	Factor 2
Change in Burnout/EI score	Pre-Post	-.060	-.063	-.096	-.081	.081	-.091	-.004
	Pre-One year	-.089	-.093	-.209	-.080	.169	-.178	.048
Change in Negative Police Subculture score	Pre-Post	.004	-.095	.093	-.092	.087	.008	-.002
	Pre-One year	.039	-.076	-.012	.024	.206	-.045	.131
Change in Organizational Support score	Pre-Post	-.143	-.001	-.114	-.178	-.122	-.075	-.175
	Pre-One year	.077	.165	.097	-.009	-.045	.144	-.031
Change in Guardianship Empathy score	Pre-Post	.068	.304*	.069	-.109	-.065	.192	-.105
	Pre-One year	.027	.199	-.040	-.127	.066	.074	-.039
Change in Guardianship Respect score	Pre-Post	.174	.276*	.196	.052	-.031	.261	.014
	Pre-One year	-.061	.141	-.019	-.212	-.101	.058	-.186
Change in CIT Support score	Pre-Post	.280	.378*	.252	.201	.037	.362*	.141
	Pre-One year	.052	.205	.182	-.078	-.161	.222	-.129
Change in CIT Organizational Value score	Pre-Post	-.058	.085	-.013	-.068	-.176	.034	-.140
	Pre-One year	-.209	.059	-.086	-.266	-.337*	-.026	-.345*

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

DISCUSSION

This report presents phase 3 results with focus on the findings from the pre/post/1-year/3-year longitudinal follow-up data collected from BLEA cohorts from November 2014 through April 2019. Results from the 1-year and 3-year longitudinal analysis show long-term sustained stability over time and significant increases in key elements of guardian-focused training particularly with respect to the CIT

Support scale, behavioral crisis items, and key items on the CIT scenarios. In addition, findings suggest that personality (as measured through the SRP-SF) moderates training effects with respect to the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Guardianship-Empathy, Guardianship-Respect, Negative Police Subculture scales.

Research Questions

Phase 3 results supplement Phase 1 and Phase 2 findings to help answer the project research questions:

Research Question #1 – Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA in comparison with law enforcement personnel who completed BLEA prior to the implementation of guardian- oriented training? (Measured by pre/post survey administration at the beginning/end of BLEA compared with cross-sectional survey responses from a comparison sample comprised of law enforcement personnel who graduated before the guardian-oriented curriculum was implemented)?
This question was addressed in the Phase 1 Pilot Study Report.

Research Question #2: Are there statistically significant training effects of the WSCJTC's guardian-oriented BLEA? (Measured by the pre-survey administration at the beginning of BLEA and post-survey completed during the last day of the academy?)
This question was addressed in the Phase 2 Longitudinal Continuation Report.

Research Question #3: Do officer characteristics predict effectiveness of the guardian style of policing? (Controlling for officer demographic and personality characteristics measured through the *Self-Report Psychopathy-SF*).
This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Longitudinal Continuation Reports.

Results from the analysis of **officer personality characteristics** show that gender, age, race/ethnicity, college education and SRP-SF scale scores moderate training effects. Officer characteristics including gender, personality, education, and race/ethnicity were associated with significant differences on several of the scales change ratings. Gender (identifying as female) was associated with significantly greater change on the Guardianship-Empathy scale. Personality (higher level of psychopathic personality traits as measured through SRP-SF scores) was negatively associated with Guardianship-Empathy scale ratings. Education (having a college degree) was positively associated with change ratings on the Negative Police Subculture scale. and race/ethnicity (identifying as nonwhite) was associated with greater change on the Negative Police Subculture. These findings suggest that officer characteristics impact training effects for specific components of guardian-focused training.

The results show that the SRP-SF Affective subscale is significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale at both the post- and 1-year measurements, as is the Factor 1 score at 1-year. These results suggest that the higher the affective component on the SRP-SF, the lower the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale rating. The finding that the SRP-SF total and lifestyle and Factor 2 subscales were significantly and positively correlated with scores on the Negative Police Subculture scale at both pre-and 1-year measurements suggest that the higher the ratings on the lifestyle component of the SRP-SF, the higher the ratings on the Negative Police Subculture scale. The finding that the SRP-SF interpersonal and Factor 1 subscales are significantly and negatively correlated with pre-BLEA scores on the Guardianship-Empathy scale suggests that high SRP-SF Factor 1 scores are associated with lower ratings on the Guardianship-Empathy scale prior to beginning the academy. The finding that the SRP-SF total and all subscales (except the antisocial and Factor 2 subscales) are significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the Guardianship-Respect scale at pre-BLEA and also significantly and negatively correlated with scores on the guardianship respect scale at the 1-year

follow-up suggests individuals who scored higher on the SRP-SF total and the SRP-SF subscales, scored lower on the guardianship respect scale and this was sustained over time. The finding that the SRP-SF interpersonal, affective, and Factor 1 subscale scores were significantly and negatively correlated with the CIT Support scale pre-BLEA suggest that individuals who scored higher on these SRP-SF subscales tended also to score lower on the CIT Support scale prior to beginning the academy. The finding that the SRP-SF affective scale score was also significantly and negatively correlated with the CIT Support scale at the one-year follow-up and that the SRP-SF Factor 2 subscale was significantly and positively correlated with the CIT Support scale post-BLEA suggests that this relationship between high SRP-SF affective scale scores and CIT support is stable over time. These Phase 3 results support Phase 2 findings that officer personality (i.e., psychopathy-level) moderates guardian-oriented training effects and suggest that officer personality is a moderating variable that has the potential to affect the direction and strength of training effects and that personality may be particularly important with respect to the concepts measured in the Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship-Empathy, and Guardianship-Respect scales.

Research Question #4: Are BLEA guardian-focused training effects sustained over time? (Measured at BLEA pre/post and 1-year/3-year post-graduation?)

This question is addressed in the Phase 2 and 3 Longitudinal Continuation Reports.

Results from the Phase 3 longitudinal analysis show long-term sustained stability over time and significant increases in key elements of guardian-focused training at 1- and 3-years post-BLEA. Results from analysis of the 1-year and 3-year data show long-term sustained stability over time and significant increases in key elements of guardian-focused training, in particular with respect to the CIT Support scale, behavioral crisis items, and key items on the CIT scenarios. Findings suggest that personality (as measured through the SRP-SF) moderates training effects in particular with respect to the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Guardianship-Empathy, Guardianship-Respect, Negative Police Subculture scales.

The results from the between-subject analysis of responses on the scales at pre/post/1-year/3-year, results show a statistically significant increase of 6.6-points in ratings from the pre-test average of 83.4, to the post-test average of 90.0, following completion of training on the **Burnout/Emotional Intelligence** scale. The one-year follow-up score was also significantly higher than the pre-test at 86.6, but the three-year follow-up score did not test as significantly different from the pre-test score. This suggests that the training effects for the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale were sustained for 1-year, but not 3-years post BEA. The finding of no significant change on the **Organizational Support** scale from the pre-test average of 76.5 to the post-test average of 76.2 but followed by a significant decrease of 4.2 points in ratings to the one-year follow-up average of 72.0, and another 4.7 points to the three-year follow-up average of 67.3, following completion of training suggests that ratings on organizational support decreased significantly over time. On the **CIT Support** scale, the results showing a statistically significant increase of 23.7 points in ratings from the pre-test average of 52.4, to the post-test average of 76.1, sustained at the one-year (72.6) and three-year (68.4) follow-ups suggests that the training effects on the CIT support were sustained over the three year time frame. On the **CIT Organizational Value** scale, results showing a statistically significant increase of 9.2-points in ratings from the pre-test average of 73.6, to the post-test average of 82.8, following completion of training, followed by a return to pre-test levels at the one-year (77.3) and three-year (71.7) follow-ups suggests that the training effects were not sustained over time for CIT Organizational Value. The finding on remaining scales (**Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship/Empathy, Guardianship /Respect**) of no statistically significant change in average ratings across all four measurement points suggest that there were not sustained training effects with respect to these scales. These findings are supported by the within-subject analyses showing statistically significant changes in four of the seven scales -- An average increase of about 6-points on the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence scale; an average decrease of about 3-points on the Guardianship – Empathy scale; an average increase of about 19-points on the CIT Support scale; and an average increase of about 5-points on the CIT Organizational Value scale. These results are largely consistent with the ANOVA findings, with the exception of the Organizational Support scale (for which an aggregate increase was observed in the ANOVA model, but with no corresponding within-individual change here)

and the Guardianship - Empathy scale for which no aggregate change was observed in the ANOVA model, showing a within-individual decrease.

For the **behavioral crisis** items, statistically significant changes in average ratings were observed for pre- and post-test groups in all but three of the seven items: *"My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly," Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly,"* and *"My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly."* These three items showed no significant change for the pre- and post-test groups. There were significant increases in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the items, *"Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work"* (a 5.6-point increase), *"Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous"* (a 6.0-point increase), *"I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis"* (a 10.5-point increase), and these increases were sustained to the three-year follow-up survey. There was also a significant increase in average ratings from pre- to post-test groups on the item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events"* (a 6.7-point increase), but average ratings at the one- and three-year follow-ups were not significantly different from the pre-test level. Results from the within subjects paired *t*-tests show statistically significant changes in all but one of the seven items. Specifically, there was an average increase of about 5- and 7-points, respectively, on the first two items, "*Incidents involving individuals in behavioral crisis are a standard part of patrol work*" and "*Calls involving persons who are experiencing behavioral crisis are dangerous*", and an average increase of about 7-points on the item, "*I am confident in my ability to handle calls involving persons in behavioral crisis.*" There was an average decrease of about 7-points on the item, "*My training indicates that it is important to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*", and an average decrease of about 5-and 6-points, respectively, on the last two items, "*Most supervisors expect patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly*" and "*My agency expects patrol officers to resolve incidents involving persons in a behavioral crisis quickly.*" There was no statistically significant change in the item, "*I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events.*" These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings, with the exception of the fourth item, *"I feel recognition and respect from the department for my skills in de-escalating behavioral crisis events,"* which exhibited no change within-individuals, but there was an increase observed in the ANOVA model between pre- and post-test groups. These results suggest that there was sustained change over time in the ley behavioral crisis items.

Results from the between-group ANOVA and post hoc Tukey's tests on the **crisis scenarios** show that for the **Depression** scenario show that officers correctly and consistently associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression at all four points of measurement. There was an increase in average pre- to post-test ratings on the item related to no increased risk of attempted suicide, but the one- and three-year averages were not significantly different from the pre-test level, and there was no difference in averages for the item related to increased risk of suicide-by-cop at all four points of measurement. Officers identified the need to assess the subject's mental state as the first priority at all four points of measurement (with the three-year follow-up significantly higher than the pre-test level). Gaining entry to secure weapons and restrain the subject was identified as a secondary priority (and there was an average decrease on this item from pre-test to three-year follow-up). A substantial decrease of about 32-points was observed in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"In speaking with Mr. N, it would be best not to ask him very directly if he was having thoughts about killing himself,"* And this decrease was sustained to the three-year follow-up measurement. There was also a decrease in average pre- to post-test scores associated with the item, *"You would attempt to get Mr. N to open the door and step outside the garage so you can talk face to face"* although the one- and three-year scores were not significantly different from the pre-test level. Finally, respondents in all groups strongly endorsed the item, *"Once you assess that Mr. N is not in imminent danger of self-harm, you give him the number for the Crisis Clinic 24-hour Crisis Line and suggest that it might be helpful for him to talk to someone"* with a significant increase from pre- to post-test. Results from within subjects paired *t*-tests for the Depression scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Depression in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a small but statistically significant increase.

Results from the within-subjects paired sample *t*-tests for the **Schizophrenia** scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Schizophrenia in both their pre- and post-test responses, with no statistically significant difference. There was an average decrease of about 6- and 13-points, respectively, in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Depression. Notably, there was a substantial average decrease of about 25-points on the item, "*In speaking with Ms. S, it is best practice if both you and your partner engage in conversation with her."* There was also an average decrease of about 13-points on the item, "*If Ms. S asks you if you hear the voices, you should say yes in order to build rapport with her"* and an average increase of about 12-points on the item, "Paraphrasing what Ms. S is saying back to her may help deescalate the situation." These results are consistent with the between-subjects ANOVA findings.

Results from within-subjects paired sample *t*-tests for the **Dementia or Alzheimer's** scenario show that officers correctly associated the symptoms portrayed in the scenario with those of Dementia or Alzheimer's in both their pre- and post-test responses, with a significant increase from pre- to post-test. There were decreases in scores associating symptoms with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Schizophrenia. Notably, there was an average decrease of about 10- points on the item, *"You determine that most likely there has been no burglary and you close the case and leave,"* instead favoring more comprehensive responses such as recognizing the need for outside help including friends or family members, and calling a Geriatric Regional Assessment Team (GRAT) or Mobile Crisis Team (MCT). These results are consistent with the ANOVA findings.

Concluding Comments

The findings presented in this Phase 3 longitudinal Report show sustained guardian-focused training effects for BLEA recruits as reflected in four of the seven scales used to measure guardian-focused training elements with significant effects in the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Support, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value scales. Additionally, findings show that guardian-focused BLEA training has significant training effects on recruits' knowledge of how to respond to behavioral crisis incidents, particularly regarding decision-making around nuanced response to individuals in behavioral crisis as reflected in results on the scenario items in the survey instrument. The most salient finding is the effect of guardian-focused training on officer support for CIT and knowledge of how to respond to incidents involving behavioral crisis. The training effects for the ratings on the CIT Support and Behavioral Crisis items were sustained over time at pre/post/1-year/3-year data collection points. This is an important finding given the centrality of CIT elements in guardian-focused academy training. The findings of the Phase 3 longitudinal study presented in this phase 3 report including 1-year and 3-year longitudinal data collected through April 2019 are consistent with the Phase 1 Report results reported in June 2015 and the Phase 2 Report results reported in 2017. In addition, the phase 3 findings support findings presented in the phase 2 report that show training effects are moderated by psychopathy level. Consistent with the prior two reports, the findings presented in the current Phase 3 Report support the ongoing use of the guardian-focused training at the WSCJTC, particularly with respect to training effects on officer burnout/emotional intelligence, organizational support, attitudes toward CIT, knowledge about how to interact with individuals in behavioral crises.

The Phase 3 findings presented in the current report are consistent with findings in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Reports showing a significant training effect for the WSCJTC guardian-oriented BLEA. The findings suggest that there are significant BLEA guardian-focused training effects that are sustained over time as measured through the seven scales used to measure components of guardian-focused training as well as the CIT components of the guardian-focused training including the behavioral crisis and scenario items. Significant training effects for all BLEA recruits were found for four of the seven scales used to measure guardian-focused training elements --in the Burnout/Emotional Intelligence, Organizational Support, CIT Support, and CIT Organizational Value scales. Additionally, findings show that guardian-focused BLEA training has significant training effects on recruit's knowledge of how to respond to behavioral crisis incidents in particular regarding decision-making around nuanced response to individuals in behavioral crisis as reflected in results on the scenario items in the survey instrument. The most salient finding is the effect of guardian-focused training on officer support for CIT and

knowledge of how to respond to incidents involving behavioral crisis. This is an important finding given the centrality of CIT elements in guardian-focused academy training. An additional important finding is the role of officer characteristics on guardian-focused training effects.

The results on the SRP-SF included in the revised survey suggest that personality moderates training effects. This is an important finding suggesting that personality plays a role in attitudes and beliefs recruits bring with them to the academy and how receptive they will be to guardian-focused training. The finding that higher scores on the SRP-SF were associated with lower levels of change on the Negative Police Subculture, Guardianship—Empathy, and Guardianship-Respect scales suggests that while these scales were rated high for the pre- and post- BLEA groups with no significant difference in training effects for the BLEA recruits as a whole, there was significantly less change for recruits who scored higher on the SRP-SF on these scales. The finding that higher scores on the SRP-SF were significantly correlated with lower scores on the Negative Police Subculture, Organizational Support, and Guardianship-Respect scales at pre-test suggests that the higher the SRP-SF scores, the lower the pre-test ratings on these scales. What is interesting about this finding is that these were the scales that did not show significant training effects for the BLEA recruits, however, scores on the SRP-SF were significantly correlated with lower ratings on these scales and decreased change suggesting that personality style may be an important baseline characteristic that moderates training effects. These findings suggest that attitudes and beliefs about empathy, respect, and adherence to negative police subculture are rooted in personality characteristics that are less impacted by training and more a manifestation of underlying individual traits that recruits bring with them to the job. These findings support prior research that has examined the ways in which psychopathic personality characteristics potentially impact police performance (Falkenbach, Glackin, & McKinley, 2016; Falkenbach, McKinley, & Larson, 2018).

The finding that officer demographic characteristics including gender, age, race/ethnicity, and familiarity with CIT were moderating variables associated with lower scale ratings at baseline and lower change at post-test is consistent with the Phase 2 findings. Results for the post-test Guardianship-Empathy model are particularly interesting showing that female officers scored about 10-points higher on average and showed significantly greater change. Similar to the findings in the Phase 2 Report, the current analysis also found that female recruits show significant change on the Guardianship-Empathy scale. The findings that SRP-SF scores are negatively associated with Guardianship-Empathy scale ratings warrant additional research to better understand the role of psychopathy-level in training effects. The finding that age is positively associated with change on the Guardianship-Respect scale, SRP-SF score is negatively associated with change on the Guardianship-Respect scale ratings, race/ethnicity (identification as nonwhite) is associated with Negative Police Subculture scale change ratings while higher SRP-SF scores are negatively associated with change on this scale is informative. These findings suggest that officer characteristics impact training effects for specific components of guardian-focused training.

The finding that gender showed a training effect for the Guardianship-Empathy scale while SRP-SF scores show a decrease in training effect on this scale is an important finding that deserves further examination. Recent research on women in policing suggests that female officers operate in ways that serve to both reinforce and challenge dominant masculine conventions in police culture whereby female officers reconfigure existing components of police culture to produce support for a progressive model of policing that encompasses both historical crime-fighting approaches and community policing practices (McCarthy, 2013). The cultural association between gender and empathy and the literature on the characteristics and skills women in policing bring to law enforcement suggest that traits associated with femininity have a potential impact on training effects. Also interesting is the negative association between SRP-SF scores and the Guardianship-Empathy scale. The construct of psychopathy measured through the SRP-SF has long been associated with traits associated with masculinity. This coupled with the fact that law enforcement is a historically gendered-masculine field and that research has found that the majority of policewomen identify as having a masculine gender identity (Swan, 2015) and that women tend to score lower on measures of psychopathy (Hare, 1990, 2003; Paulhus et al, 2016) and are also fewer in number in law enforcement (Seklecki & Paynich, 2007) suggests that this is an important area for future research to examine the impact of and interaction between gender and personality in law enforcement training and culture.

Continued longitudinal study is needed to examine what may be occurring with respect to baseline officer characteristics that may be related to the ability of officers to engage in empathetic and respectful interactions with citizens. It could be that the ability to be empathetic and respectful in police-citizen interactions is more a function of officer individual characteristics than it is a result of training and/or, as the data presented here suggest, that training effects are moderated by officers' individual characteristics. For example, if the ability to empathetically and respectfully connect with citizens in police-citizen interactions and engage in a respectful manner is more associated with officer individual-level character than with training, this has important implications for screening in the recruitment and selection process.

One weakness of the longitudinal study should be noted: Difficulties in obtaining participation in the longitudinal 1- and 3-year follow-up data collection points resulted in a relatively small group of BLEA graduates who participated in the longitudinal follow-up component of the study. While the subsample in the longitudinal study (*n*= 140 at 1-year, *n*= 116 at 3-year) is sufficient for data analysis, a larger sample of BLEA graduates participating in the longitudinal follow-up would strengthen the findings.

This final report presents results from BLEA recruits from November 2014 through April 2019 with longitudinal results from recruits who completed the 1- and 3-year follow-up surveys. Longitudinal follow-up data collection will continue through December 2020. This additional longitudinal follow-up data will enable a better understanding of the relationship between law enforcement agency culture, officer characteristics, and WSJTC guardian-oriented training effects over time as the recruits move further in their careers.

REFERENCES

Babiak, P. (2016). Psychopathic manipulation at work. In Gacono, C. B. (Ed.) *The clinical and forensic assessment of psychopathy.* New York: Routledge, 353-373.

Babiak, P. & Hare, R.D. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work.* Ragen Books.

Babiak, P. & O'Toole, M.E. (2012). The corporate psychopath. *FBI Law Bulletin, 81*(11), 218-219.

Bahora, M., Hanafi, S., Chien, V., & Compton, M. (2008). Preliminary evidence of effects of crisis intervention team training on self-efficacy and social distance. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research,* 159-167.

Bernstein, A.J. (2001). *Emotional vampires: Dealing with people who drain you dry.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Borum, Deane, Steadman, & Morrissey. (1998). Police perspectives on responding to mentally ill people in crisis: Perceptions of program effectiveness. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 16(4), 393-405..*

Cleckley, H. (1941). *The mask of sanity: An attempt to clarify some issues about the so-called psychopathic personality.* Augusta, GA: Emily S. Cleckley.

Compton, M. T., & Chien, V. H. (2008). Factors related to knowledge retention after crisis intervention team training for police officers. *Psychiatric Services, 59*(9), 1049-1051.

Compton, M. T., Bahora, M., Watson, A. C., & Oliva, J. R. (2008). A comprehensive review of extant research on Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) programs. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*, *36*(1), 47-55.

Compton, M. T., Bakeman, R., Broussard, B., Hankerson-Dyson, D., Husbands, L., Krishan, S., ... & Watson, A. C. (2014). The police-based crisis intervention team (CIT) model: I. effects on officers' knowledge, attitudes, and skills. *Psychiatric Services, 65*(4), 517-522.

Compton, M. T., Bakeman, R., Broussard, B., Hankerson-Dyson, D., Husbands, L., Krishan, S., ... & Watson, A. C. (2014). The police-based crisis intervention team (CIT) model: II. Effects on level of force and resolution, referral, and arrest. *Psychiatric Services, 65*(4):523-9.

Compton, M. T., Esterberg, M. L., McGee, R., Kotwicki, R. J., & Oliva, J. R. (2006). Brief reports: crisis intervention team training: changes in knowledge, attitudes, and stigma related to schizophrenia. *Psychiatric Services, 57*(8), 1199-1202.

Dionne, P. (1996). The evaluation of training activities: A complex issue involving different stakes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 7*(3), 279.

Dupont, R., Cochran, S., & Pillsbury, S. (2007). Crisis intervention team core elements. Unpublished report, Univeristy of Memphis.

Dutton, K. (2012). *The wisdom of psychopaths: What saints, spies, and serial killers can teach us about success.* New York: Scientific American/Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Dutton, K. & McNab, A. (2014). *The good psychopath's guide to success: How to use your inner psychopath to get the most out of your life.* Long Beach, CA: Apostrophe Books.

Falkenbach, D.M., Glackin, E., & McKinley, S. (2018). Twigs on the same branch? Identifying personality profiles in police officers using psychopathic personality traits. *Journal of Research in Personality, 76*(1), 102-112.

Falkenbach, D.M., McKinley, S., & Larson, F.R.R. (2016). Two Sides of the Same Coin: Psychopathy Case Studies from an Urban Police Department. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice, 17*(5), 338-356.

Flynn, D., van Schaik, P., & van Wersch, A. (2004). A Comparison of Multi-Item Likert and Visual Analogue Scales for the Assessment of Transactionally Defined Coping Function. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 20*(1), 49.

Gordts, S., Uzieblo, K., Neumann, C., Van den Bussche, E., & Rossi, G. (2017). Validity of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scales (SRP-III Full and Short Versions) in a community sample. *Assessme*nt, 24(3), 308-325.

Guyatt, G. H., Townsend, M., Berman, L. B., & Keller, J. L. (1987). A comparison of Likert and visual analogue scales for measuring change in function. *Journal of chronic diseases, 40*(12), 1129-1133.

Hall, J. R. & Benning, S.D. (2006). The "successful psychopath": Adaptive and subclinical manifestations of psychopathy in the general population. In Patrick, C.J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Psychopathy,* 459-480.

Hare, R.D. (1998). Psychopaths and their nature: Implications for the mental health and criminal justice systems. In Millon, T., Simonsen, E., Briket-Smith, & Davis, R. (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, Criminal & Violent Behavior* (pp. 188-212). New York: The Guilford Press.

Hare R. D. (1991, 2003). *Manual for the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.

Hare, R.D. & Neumann, C.S. (2006). The PCL-R assessment of psychopathy. In Patrick, C.J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Psychopathy*, 58-88.

Hatfield, R. E. (2014). Training law enforcement in mental health: a broad-based model.

Helfgott, J.B., Hickman, M.J., & Malterud, E.M. (June 30, 2017). The effect of guardian-focused training for law enforcement officers. Retrieved from https://www.seattleu.edu/artsci/departments/criminal/crime-and-justice-research-center/collaborative-research/

Helfgott, J.B., Atherley, L., Pollock, J., Vinson, J., Strah, B., Neidhart, E., Conn-Johnson, C., Hickman, M., & Wood, N. (June 30, 2015). Evaluation of the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission's "Warriors to Guardians" Cultural Shift and Crisis Intervention (CIT) Training Final Report. Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission Consultant Agreement. Retrieved from: https://www.seattleu.edu/media/college-of-arts-and-sciences/departments/criminaljustice/documents/Helfgott-et-al_WSCJTC-Evaluation_FINALREPORT_WEB.docx8789.pdf

Helfgott, J.B., Conn-Johnson, C., & Wood, N. (May 21, 2015). *Seattle Police Department CIT Culture Survey Final Report.* Seattle Police Foundation/City of Seattle Police Department Consultant Agreement.

Hojat, M., Gonnella, J. S., Mangione, S., Nasca, T. J., Veloski, J. J., Erdmann, J. B., ... & Magee, M. (2002). Empathy in medical students as related to academic performance, clinical competence and gender. *Medical education, 36*(6), 522-527.

Hung, T. K. (2010). An empirical study of the training evaluation decision-making model to measure training outcome. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 38(1), 87-101. Kirkpatrick, D. (1979). Techniques for Evaluating Training. *Training & Development Journal,* 78-92.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1967). Evaluation of training. In R. L. Craig & L. R. Bittel (Eds.), *Training and Development Handbook* (pp. 87-112). New York: McGraw Hill.

McCarthy, D.J. (2013). Gendered 'soft' policing: Multi-agency working, female cops, and the fluidities of police culture/s. *Policing & Society, 23(*2), 261-278.

Morabito, M., Watson, A., & Draine, J. (2013). Police officer acceptance of new innovation: the case of crisis intervention teams. . *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 421-436.

Neal, T.M. & Sellbom, M. (2012) Examining the factor structure of the Hare Self-Report psychopathy scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*(3), 244-253.

Neumann, C. (2015). SRP Validation. Unpublished manuscript.

Neumann, C.S., Hare, R.D., & Pardini, D. A. (2014). Antisociality and the construct of psychopathy: Data from across the globe. *Journal of Personality, 83*(6), 678-692

Neumann CS, Kosson DS, Salekin RT. Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Psychopathy Construct: Methodological and Conceptual Issues. In: Hervé H, Yuille JC, editors. The Psychopath: Theory, Research, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum; 2007. pp. 79–104.

Neumann, C.S. & Pardini, D.A. (2014). Factor structure and construct validity of the Self-Report Pychopathy (SRP) Scale and the Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI) in young men. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 28*(3), 419-433,

Paulhus, D.L., Neumann, C.S., & Hare, R.D. (2016). *Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-Fourth Edition* (SRP-4). North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Phillips, J. J. (1997). Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods. Routledge.

Rahr, S., & Rice, S. K. (2015). From Warriors to Guardians: Recommitting American Police Culture to Democratic Ideals.

Reips, U. D., & Funke, F. (2008). Interval-level measurement with visual analogue scales in Internet-based research: VAS Generator. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 699-704.

Rule, W. (2013). *Born to Destroy.* (E-mail: Winifred.rule@gmail.com)

Sanford, J.S. & Arrigo, B.A. (2007). Policing and psychopathy: The case of Robert Philip Hanssen. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 7*(3), 1-31.

Secklecki, R. & Paynich, R. (2007). A national survey of female police officers: An Overview of findings. *Police Practice and Research, 8*(1), 17-30.

Seibert, L.A., Miller, J.D., Few, L.R., Zeichner, A., & Lynam, D. (2011). An examination of the structure of self-report psychopathy measures and their relations with general traits and externalizing behaviors. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 2*(3), 193-208.

Simon, G.K. (2010). *In sheep's clothing: Understanding and dealing manipulative people.* Little Rock, AK: Parkhurst Brothers Publishers Inc.

Simon, G.K. (2011). *Character disturbance: The phenomenon of our age.* Little Rock: Packhurst Brother's Inc.

Smidt, A., Balandin, S., Sigafoos, J., & Reed, V. A. (2009). The Kirkpatrick model: A useful tool for evaluating training outcomes. Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability, 34(3), 266-274.

Swan, A.A. (2015). Masculine, feminine, or androgynous: The influence of gender identity on job satisfaction among female police officers. *Women & Criminal Justice, 26*(1), 1-19.

Tew, J., Harkins, L., & Dixon, L. (2015). Assessing the reliability and validity of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scales in a UK offender population. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 26*(2), 166-184.

Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why people obey the law.* Princeton University Press.

Tyler, T. R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal institutions?*. Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 19(2), 215-235.

Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. (2002). Trust in the law: encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts through. Russell Sage Foundation.

Vitacco, M.J., Neumann, C.S., & Pardini, D.A. (2014). Predicting future criminal offending in a community-based sample of males using self-reported psychopathy. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 41*(3), 345-363.

Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four factor structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*, 205–219.

Weisburd, D. & Greenspan, R. (2000). Police Attitudes Toward Abuse of Authority. NIJ: Research in Brief. Available via https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/181312.pdf.

Weisburd, D., Greenspan, R., Hamilton, E. E., Bryant, K. A., & Williams, H. (2001). The abuse of police authority: A national study of police officers' attitudes. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.