



College of
Policing

college.police.uk

Evaluation of National Roll-out of Police Vulnerability Training

Version 1.0

January 2019

Callen, A. (Institute for Employment Studies)

Cockett, J. (Institute for Employment Studies)

Edwards, M. (Institute for Employment Studies)

McClean, F. (College of Policing)

© – College of Policing Limited (2019)

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Non-Commercial College Licence v1.1 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence visit

http://www.college.police.uk/Legal/Documents/Non_Commercial_College_Licence.pdf

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned. This publication may contain public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0 at

www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/

This publication is available for download at

https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/Vulnerability_roll-out_eval.pdf

Any enquiries regarding this publication please contact us at the College on 0800 4963322 or email contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

This document has been created with the intention of making the content accessible to the widest range of people regardless of disability or impairment. To enquire about having this document provided in an alternative format please contact us at the College on 0800 4963322 or email contactus@college.pnn.police.uk

Institute for Employment Studies

IES is an independent, apolitical, international centre of research and consultancy in public employment policy and HR management. It works closely with employers in all sectors, government departments, agencies, professional bodies and associations. IES is a focus of knowledge and practical experience in employment and training policy, the operation of labour markets, and HR planning and development. IES is a not-for-profit organisation.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all police officers, police staff and trainers who gave up their time to be interviewed and all stakeholders at the College of Policing for undertaking interviews and observations and their ongoing feedback and guidance. The authors would also like to thank Kate Arnill-Graham for their help with the final report. I would also like to thank Professor Wes Skogan of North Western University for his valuable input through peer reviewing the report. Finally, we would like to explicitly thank West Mercia Police force for taking part in the evaluation and making this research possible.

Institute for Employment Studies

City Gate

185 Dyke Road

Brighton BN3 1TL

UK

Telephone: +44 (0)1273 763400

Email: askIES@employment-studies.co.uk

Website: www.employment-studies.co.uk

Copyright © 2018 Institute for Employment Studies

IES project code: 00917-4905

Contents

Executive summary	6
1. Introduction	9
1.1. Background	9
1.2. Aims of the evaluation	11
1.3. Structure of report	11
2. Method	12
2.1. Measurement tool development.....	12
2.2. Evaluation activity.....	13
2.2.1. Surveys.....	13
2.2.2. Interviews	14
2.2.3. Observations.....	14
3. Findings.....	15
3.1. Pre/post survey	15
3.1.1. Impact of training on attitudes	16
3.1.2. Impact of training on knowledge.....	18
3.1.3. Impact of training on confidence	19
3.1.4. Identifying themes.....	20
3.1.5. Macro-level impact of training	21
3.2. Follow-up survey	22
3.2.1. Sustained impact of training.....	23
3.2.2. Identifying themes.....	23
3.2.3. Macro-level impact of the training	24
3.3. Interviews and observations	26
3.3.1. Key themes.....	27
3.3.2. Force context.....	27
3.3.3. Trainer preparation	28
3.3.4. Delivery.....	28
3.3.5. Content.....	29
3.3.6. Impact.....	31
3.3.7. Potential developments.....	31
3.3.8. Overall general impressions.....	31

4. Discussion	33
4.1. Immediate impact.....	33
4.2. Sustained impact.....	34
4.3. Perceptions of training.....	36
4.4. Conclusions.....	37
4.5. Limitations.....	38
5. Recommendations	39
5.1. Delivery.....	39
5.2. Content.....	39
5.3. Embedding learning.....	39
6. Bibliography	40
7. Appendix	41
A: Pre/post survey.....	41
B: Follow-up survey.....	49
C: Observation record form.....	54
D: Pre/post survey full results.....	57
E: Pre/post factor results.....	60
F: Pre/post factor analysis.....	61
G: Follow-up survey demographic details.....	62
H: Follow-up survey item results.....	64
I: Follow-up survey factor analysis.....	69
J: Follow-up survey factor results.....	71
K: Follow-up survey items – non-significant questions.....	72

Executive summary

In 2017, the College of Policing piloted a one-day, face-to-face training package aimed at improving ability of frontline officers and staff to identify and manage vulnerability and risk of harm. Following the evaluation of this pilot, the College rolled out the training nationally to 9,000 officers and staff. The Institute of Employment Studies (IES) was commissioned to evaluate the impact of the final training package. The evaluation takes a mixed methods approach to assess the impact of the training programme against the strategic aims of the College. Surveys (developed from the pilot evaluation) measured the immediate and sustained impact of the training, and in-depth interviews with trainees and trainers provided in-depth contextual data.

The results from the pre/post survey showed that there had been an immediate positive impact of the training on attitudes, knowledge and confidence when dealing with vulnerability. Overall, the pre-training scores showed relatively high levels of desired responses, which illustrated a greater base knowledge before training of the participants in the roll-out force compared to the pilot forces. This is potentially due to the force having undertaken other activity to improve responses to vulnerability in recent years. However, despite the initial high base level of desired attitudes, the pre/post survey evidenced that the training had an immediate and substantial positive impact on the attitudes, confidence and knowledge of trainees.

The impact of the training was measured after one month, due to short timescales, by comparing the training group to a control group. After one month, the observed increase in knowledge and skills, which was demonstrated by staff immediately after the training, showed evidence of being sustained. However, the change in staff attitudes observed immediately after training had not been sustained. Notably, the greatest difference between the control and intervention groups was seen for the factor 'familiarity with contributors to vulnerability'. This factor measured the participants' self-assessed familiarity with the underlying risk factors and behaviours that have been found to contribute to increasing the risk of harm, such as: perpetrator motivations, adverse childhood events and response to trauma.

Overall, the training was well received in terms of delivery and content. The content was generally considered informative and useful, although it was highlighted that there could have been more focus on police self-care. The trainees were particularly positive about the facilitated discussions and sharing of personal experiences, both by the trainees and

trainers. During interviews, trainers affirmed the effectiveness of the discussions and recommended that more time be dedicated to them in future.

A number of issues were identified as inhibiting the successful delivery of the training. Firstly, trainees and trainers felt that there was too much content to be thoroughly covered in a single day. This concern was mirrored in the findings from the pilot evaluation. In addition, the trainers raised issues about the preparation for the day. The training material was designed to be comprehensive and, although the 'Train the Trainer' day was deemed more effective than its pilot equivalent, trainers said that they would have liked the material earlier. The College trainer and the force trainer also had some issues with coordinating the delivery of the training. This reinforces the need to ensure that those delivering the training in future are properly prepared and have attended a College training day.

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of the evaluation. Firstly, the roll-out evaluation took place in one force, which limits the ability to generalise the results. There may be, for example, underlying contextual factors specific to West Mercia Police that unduly influenced the results. Secondly, the data showed that the respondents had a high base knowledge surrounding vulnerability, which limited the extent to which increases in knowledge, attitudes and skills could be observed or measured. Finally, there is evidence that some responses to the pre/post survey may have been copied from the training material, rather than recalled from memory, therefore limiting the ability to conclude that the training improved trainee knowledge.

Recommendations

- Facilitate effective trainer preparation by providing all training materials in good time before the training.
- Tailor input according to the existing level of knowledge of participants.
- Review and develop the interactive exercises included, specifically those relating to communication skills.
- Consider reducing the volume of content and the number of objectives to be achieved in a single day.
- Maximise learning potential by increasing the time dedicated to facilitated discussion.
- Allow more time for content and discussion about resilience and self-care for police officers and staff.
- Review the introduction video to identify and remove content perceived to negatively impact the trainees' attitude.

- Review the content on the development of empathy, rapport building and responding to those affected by trauma to ensure clarity, depth and audience suitability.
- Incorporate force vulnerability initiatives into the training to emphasise the strategic priority at a local level, and support the ongoing application and embedding of new knowledge and behaviour recommendations.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

The College of Policing received Home Office funding for a College Vulnerability Programme which aimed to transform the police's approach to vulnerability. Police use the term vulnerability if factors exist in a situation that might make it more likely for harm to occur to individuals, or of which perpetrators might take advantage. In the past, vulnerability has been closely linked to personal factors, such as disability or age, with less understanding of the wider range of factors which might increase the risk of harm.

The police have experienced a change in the profile of demand over recent years (for a more detailed explanation of this see https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/Vulnerability_training_eval.pdf) and this has increased the frequency with which frontline staff encounter vulnerable people. It is key that the police, as the first point of contact, recognise and assess the signs of vulnerability to ensure that appropriate access to support services, to prevent future harm, is provided to vulnerable people. There are a number of definitions of vulnerability used in the sector, however, due to the complex and dynamic nature of vulnerability, the College have adopted the most comprehensive and applicable definition:

‘A person is vulnerable if, as a result of their situation or circumstances, they are unable to take care of or protect themselves, or others, from harm or exploitation.’

Frontline officers and staff are in a key position to recognise the early signs of those who are more vulnerable to victimisation and/or harm and to subsequently manage that situation. A huge amount of responsibility is placed on frontline staff, therefore, appropriate support and training must be provided to build the knowledge and skills required for their role.

As part of this College Vulnerability Programme, a one-day, face-to-face training course was developed to improve the skills of all frontline officers and staff. The training covers, among other subjects, the definition of vulnerability and the risk factors to look out for, the impact of trauma on the brain, the potential reactions to trauma, communication skills that can help, and tactics which can be used to support and manage vulnerable people. Two case studies are included to highlight key areas and allow for facilitated discussion during the training day. For more detail see <https://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Development/Vulnerability/Pages/Vulnerability.aspx>

The Institute for Employment Studies (IES) was commissioned to carry out an impact evaluation of the national roll-out of the College Vulnerability Programme. From December 2017, the training was rolled out to seven forces in England, with West Mercia Police volunteering as the subject of the evaluation.

The training was piloted in three police forces across England in 2017. IES conducted an evaluation of the pilot and provided a [report](#) and a set of thorough development recommendations to the College. Based on the pilot evaluation outcomes, the training programme was revised to incorporate the recommended changes in order to maximise the effectiveness of the training. These changes included:

- a requirement for one of the two trainers presenting the course to have attended the College 'Train the Trainer' day
- careful choice of trainers to ensure that one had local knowledge and the other knowledge of vulnerability, and that both were experienced and able to deliver the complex messages of the training
- amendments to the trainer manual to provide more specific instructions and include greater detail on some aspects of the course content to ensure more consistent teaching of key points
- the inclusion of a video of an expert in the field explaining the impact of trauma on the brain to improve consistency of delivery
- a greater range of video case studies available for forces to choose from, including ones focused on topical issues, such as forced marriage, radicalisation and internet-based grooming
- greater focus on the ongoing application of knowledge and skills from the training to real life situations
- reference materials for participants to take away, including a booklet of national referral and support agencies
- greater focus on and reinforcement of key messages throughout the day.

For full information about the background and the training intervention please see https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/Vulnerability_training_eval.pdf.

1.2. Aims of the evaluation

Following the pilot, the College identified a number of aims for the national roll-out, including:

- assess the impact of the revised training on the knowledge, skills and attitudes of police officers and staff
- understand the perceptions of the revised training content and delivery
- produce a final set of measurement tools for use in future evaluations.

1.3. Structure of report

- Chapter 2 will briefly outline the evaluation research methodology.
- Chapter 3 will report the quantitative and qualitative findings.
- Chapter 4 will discuss the main findings across all the research methods, highlight the immediate and longer-term impact and perceptions of the training, and offer conclusions about overall training effectiveness and recommendations for future development.

2. Method

2.1. Measurement tool development

During the pilot phase of the evaluation, the initial survey measurement tools were designed to be robust instruments for use in the national roll-out and future evaluations. The surveys underwent two phases of development activity:

1. Statistical analysis – the distribution and mean responses were measured for each survey item to ensure the data was considered ‘normal’ and mean scores were not skewed positively or negatively. Factor analysis also identified any underlying constructs which could be developed into reliable factors.
2. Cognitive testing – the surveys underwent extensive cognitive testing with police officers to understand how they interpreted the questions and instructions, understood the meaning of questions, and responded to the design of the survey.

The statistical analysis of the pre/post pilot survey showed that there were several underlying themes which could be developed to form reliable factors for the second phase of the research. Additionally, the analysis identified the survey questions that had positively skewed responses, suggesting they were worded in such a way as to encourage agreement. During cognitive testing, participants explained the problems with these questions and the difficulty they had in answering them, often commenting on the ambiguity of the wording or the socially desirable nature of some questions.

Informed by the outcomes from the analysis and cognitive testing, the pre/post and follow-up survey were both revised based on the following principles:

- remove or reword items perceived to elicit socially desirable responses
- remove or reword items with ‘obvious’ answers
- clarify items with ambiguous meaning and remove multi-clause sentences
- strengthen or weaken the adverb in statements with non-normally distributed responses
- reduce the survey length to improve response rate
- introduce more simple question types and response scales
- develop additional items to strengthen the reliability of the underlying factors identified during analysis.

2.2. Evaluation activity

The three phases of data collection activity are described below. The analysis of data for each phase will follow the analysis plan outlined and executed in the [pilot evaluation](#).

2.2.1. Surveys

Pre/post survey

The pre/post survey was designed to test the immediate transfer of training. That is, the extent to which trainees acquired new or increased knowledge, confidence and attitudes from the training programme. The survey contained three question types:

1. **Attitude (17 items)** – measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7)
2. **Knowledge (2 items)** – open, free text questions based on specific course content
3. **Confidence (6 items)** – measured on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from very unconfident (1) to very confident (4).

Participants completed the same survey immediately prior to and immediately following training. Ten attitude items were reverse coded to control for response bias and to reduce the likelihood that trainees would automatically respond positively to every item. To prevent any potential effects of respondents completing the same survey twice, the questions were presented in a different order on pre and post surveys. See appendix A for a copy of the survey.

Follow-up survey

The follow-up attitude survey was designed to measure the longer-term impact of the training. The survey contained two different types of questions:

1. **Attitude (36 items):** measured on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).
2. **Familiarity (5 items):** measured on a 4-point Likert scales ranging from not familiar at all (1) to extremely familiar (4).

Nineteen questions were reverse coded to prevent participants from positively responding to all items. The follow-up survey was distributed to the 'intervention' group who had completed the training, and to a 'control group' who had not received training. The control group was identified by West Mercia, selected from areas that had not yet received the training and with a demographic profile similar to that of the intervention group. The survey was distributed via

an online platform (SNAP) approximately one month after the intervention group had completed the training. Question order was randomised to reduce any unintentional bias introduced through the order of questions. See Appendix B for a copy of the survey.

2.2.2. Interviews

Eleven interviews were conducted with eight trainees and three trainers. Two trainers were from West Mercia Police and one was an associate of the College of Policing. The trainees held a variety of different roles, as outlined in Table 3.12.

2.2.3. Observations

Two observations of the training were undertaken to discern whether the content was delivered as intended and to understand participant engagement and attitudes towards the training. Details of the observations were recorded in a standard format to ensure information on the delivery of the different elements of the training was captured (see Appendix C).

3. Findings

3.1. Pre/post survey

In total, 349 individuals completed the pre and post surveys (see Table 3.1). The statistical method best suited to analyse the data required each respondent’s pre and post survey responses to be matched using a unique identifier. Non-matched data is excluded from this analysis. In total, 149 surveys were excluded, resulting in a total matched sample of 100.

Table 3.1: Number of responses

Condition	Total N	N Matched pre/post survey	Per cent of Total N used in analysis
Pre	197	100	50.8%
Post	152	100	65.8%
Total	349		

The pre/post survey assessed the immediate transfer of the training. For each item, the difference in scores between the pre and post surveys was analysed. A paired sample t-test was used if the responses were normally distributed or a Wilcoxon signed-rank test if responses were non-normally distributed. The following questions were identified as showing a non-normal distribution; Q2, Q4, Q8, Q9, Q10, Q12, Q13, Q15.

In total, 23 of 25 questions showed a significant increase in mean scores following the training (two questions did not show a significant difference). A positive mean change indicates that the training had the anticipated impact and that the trainees more frequently gave the desired response post training. Results from the attitude, confidence and knowledge questions are discussed in turn below (please see Appendix D for the full results). Based on the results from a previous study undertaken by the College, it was determined that a mean difference of half a mark between the pre and post scores is considered meaningful (see <http://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/Technical-Report.pdf>) and is sufficient to demonstrate the training was successful. However, to allow for the comparison of the magnitude of differences across items, the ‘effect size’ is included. This represents the standardised difference between the pre and post scores and is based on Cohen’s d. It is interpreted as follows:

Table 3.2: Interpreting effect size

Cohen's d	Effect Size
> 0.2	Not meaningful
0.2 - 0.34	Small
0.35 - 0.49	Small - Medium
0.5 - 0.64	Medium
0.65 - 0.79	Medium - Large
0.8 +	Large

See Cohen, J. (1988) for full explanation.

3.1.1. Impact of training on attitudes

Table 3.3 shows that trainees displayed an increase in desired attitudes immediately after training. Overall, 15 out of 17 attitude questions demonstrated a positive significant difference between the pre and post scores. The magnitude of the difference varies depending on the question. These results suggest that the training had an immediate positive impact on trainee attitudes about vulnerability and working with vulnerable people.

Table 3.3: Pre vs post item-by-item t-tests – attitude questions

	Question	Mean change	Significant	Cohen's d	Effect size
1	When responding to a crime, police officers should NOT prioritise gathering evidence over reassuring the victim.	+0.63***	Yes	0.44	Small - Medium
2	I will never leave a vulnerable person without giving them details of who else can help them.	-0.01	No	-0.01	NA
3	Being concerned about building relationships SHOULD be a big part of a police officer's job.	+0.53***	Yes	0.40	Small - Medium

4	It is vital for me to ask difficult and unwelcomed questions even if they make me uncomfortable.	+0.32**	Yes	0.32	Small
5	Having strong feelings in response to a victim's situation is an inevitable and normal part of policing.	-0.09	No	-0.08	NA
6	Some victims of crime are NOT more deserving of a good service than others.	+0.48**	Yes	0.28	Small
7	It is NOT difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free.	+0.53***	Yes	0.35	Small - Medium
8	Assessing a person's capability to support themselves is a very important part of my job.	+0.48***	Yes	0.57	Medium
9	I will always give a victim an opportunity to tell me how they would like an incident resolved.	+0.11*	Yes	0.11	Not meaningful
10	I SHOULD be spending time on a person or situation unless a crime has been committed.	+0.25**	Yes	0.26	Small
11	It is NOT important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it.	+0.69***	Yes	0.56	Medium
12	If a victim of a crime won't help themselves THERE IS much I can do to help them.	+0.42***	Yes	0.42	Small - Medium
13	For every situation I deal with, I will continually assess if there is more going on than first reported.	+0.40***	Yes	0.48	Small - Medium

14	Some vulnerable people do NOT DO little to deserve the help of the police.	+0.28*	Yes	0.22	Small
15	It is NOT a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people.	+0.20*	Yes	0.19	Not meaningful
16	Some of the victims that I work with could NOT behave better if they really wanted to.	+0.76***	Yes	0.49	Small - Medium
17	Repeat exposure to adverse experiences in childhood reduces ability for rational thinking and learning.	+0.83***	Yes	0.59	Medium

Questions highlighted in green display a significant difference in the expected direction between the pre and post scores. Non-highlighted questions were not significant.

Words in capitals have been added for the purpose of interpreting the results; these were not included in the original questions.

Significance level = * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Only two attitude questions were identified as non-significant. One of the items, 'I will never leave a vulnerable person without giving them details of who else can help them', exhibited the highest mean score of all the items in the pre survey (6.20). It is likely that these high levels of agreement pre training meant that training could do little to increase this attitude further. The second item, 'having strong feelings in response to a victim's situation is an inevitable and normal part of policing', showed a small, non-significant decrease after training. However, because the vast majority of items displayed a positive increase in post-training scores, this single result is not thought to be consequential to the overall impact of the training.

3.1.2. Impact of training on knowledge

The responses to the knowledge questions show highly significant increases in scores post training (as shown in Table 3.4). This indicates that, post training, trainees were better able to define vulnerability and identify personal and situational risk factors that make a person vulnerable to harm.

The difference in pre and post scores for question 18, ‘what is the definition of vulnerability in the context of policing’, demonstrated a ‘medium’ sized change. However, the pre survey mean score was relatively high in comparison to the mean score for the same question in the pilot evaluation (3.00 compared to 1.37). This suggests that the trainees in this sample had a greater base knowledge before training than the pilot participants, which may account for the smaller effect size.

Question 19, ‘name the personal and situational factors you should consider when determining if someone is vulnerable to harm’, demonstrated a very large increase following training, despite an already high pre survey mean (5.04). This indicates that, although trainees had a high level of prior knowledge about risk factors, the training was still successful in increasing knowledge.

Table 3.4: Pre vs post item-by-item t-tests – knowledge questions

	Question	Mean change	Significant	Cohen’s d	Effect size
18	What is the definition of vulnerability in the context of policing?	+1.71***	Yes	0.57	Medium
19	Name the personal and situational factors you should consider when determining if someone is vulnerable to harm.	+4.50***	Yes	0.96	Large

Significance level = *** p<0.001

3.1.3. Impact of training on confidence

Six confidence questions were measured on a 4 point Likert scale from 1 (very unconfident) to 4 (very confident). Trainees demonstrated a highly significant increase in confidence for all six questions post training (see Table 3.5), for example, when assessing risk or knowing how to work in a trauma informed way. In five of the six cases, the magnitude of the change was medium or large, indicating a very meaningful increase in confidence after the training.

Table 3.5: Pre vs post item-by-item t-tests – confidence questions

	Question	Mean change	Significant	Cohen's d	Effect size
20	How confident are you that you know where you can refer vulnerable people to in your area?	+0.54***	Yes	0.67	Medium - Large
21	How confident are you in assessing if an individual is at risk from harm?	+0.35***	Yes	0.55	Medium
22	How confident are you that you understand how to work in a trauma informed way?	+0.98***	Yes	1.35	Large
23	How confident are you that you could recognise the effects of trauma in yourself and colleagues?	+0.63***	Yes	0.87	Large
24	How confident are you with the prevention and disruption options for victims and perpetrators?	+0.68***	Yes	0.92	Large
25	How confident are you that you would be supported to take more time when dealing with a vulnerable person?	+0.51***	Yes	0.48	Small - Medium

Significance level = *** p<0.001

3.1.4. Identifying themes

Factor analysis is a technique used to identify underlying themes in survey data. Statistical analysis groups together questions which relate to similar concepts, allowing for further analysis at the theme level. Since the pre/post survey was developed based on emerging factors identified in the pilot analysis, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was run to establish if the expected underlying themes (known as factors) emerged again. Factors must be reliable to be used in further analysis, ie, they must be an accurate and robust measure of

the underlying theme. Reliability is measured by Cronbach’s alpha – an alpha of 0.7 or greater generally indicates the factor is acceptable to use for analysis.¹

The analysis identified two highly reliable factors that could be used for further analysis. Each factor was named by cross-referencing the questions that identified it with the relevant training material. Factor 1 was named ‘attitudes to vulnerability’, and Factor 2 ‘confidence in dealing with vulnerability’ (see Table 3.6). Further details of the factors can be found in Appendix E.

Table 3.6: Pre/post factor analysis results

Factor	Factor name	Description	Alpha reliability
1	Attitudes to vulnerability	Attitudes towards vulnerable people and the role of the police in dealing with vulnerability	0.82
2	Confidence in dealing with vulnerability	Respondents’ confidence in dealing with a variety of types of issues relating to vulnerability	0.80

3.1.5. Macro-level impact of training

Factor level analysis provided insight about the impact of the training on ‘attitudes to vulnerability’ and ‘confidence in dealing with vulnerability’.

A composite mean is created for each factor, which subsequently undergoes statistical analysis (the same process as for individual items). Table 3.7 shows that both factors demonstrated a highly significant increase in scores following the training. Trainees showed a highly significant improvement in their attitudes towards vulnerability and vulnerable people and, markedly, trainee confidence in dealing with vulnerability demonstrated a large and highly significant increase following the training (see Appendix F for the full results).

¹ Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Table 3.7: Pre/post factor t-tests

Factor	Mean Change	Significant	Cohen's d	Effect size
1 Attitudes to vulnerability	+0.45***	Yes	0.44	Small - Medium
2 Confidence in dealing with vulnerability	+0.61***	Yes	0.96	Large

Significance level = *** p<0.001

Overall, the pre/post survey provides evidence that the training had an immediate and substantial positive impact on the attitudes, confidence and knowledge of trainees.

3.2. Follow-up survey

The follow-up survey, distributed approximately one month after training, measured vulnerability knowledge, attitudes and skills. Data was collected from the intervention group and from a control group. The intervention group included the sample of police officers and staff that had completed the training one month previously. The control group acted as a point of reference by allowing for comparison with individuals who had not received the training. Statistical analysis confirmed that there were no significant differences for any demographic variables (gender, role, age and length of service), meaning the control and intervention groups were made up of similar individuals (see Appendix G).

A total of 241 individuals responded to the follow-up survey. Table 3.8 shows the response rate for each group.

Table 3.8: Follow-up response rate

	N Distributed	N Responded	Response rate
Intervention	223	111	49.8
Control	241	82	34.0
Total	464	193	41.6

Preliminary analysis showed that 15 trainees from the control group reported to have received information about the training from colleagues who had attended. Therefore, these individuals may have vicariously gained knowledge about the vulnerability training content, which could contaminate the control group and skew the results. Subsequently, they were excluded from further analysis. Table 3.9 shows the final sample used in the analysis.

Table 3.9: Follow-up final sample

	N	Per cent
Intervention	97	61
Control	62	39
Total	153	100.0

Preliminary descriptive statistics and item-by-item t-tests were run prior to the full analysis (see Appendix H for the full results).

3.2.1. Sustained impact of training

It is difficult to draw conclusions about the sustained impact of the training when analysing the data at an item-by-item level. Factor analysis, however, allows for macro-level analysis. The follow-up survey was developed based on emerging factors identified in the pilot analysis. CFA was then run to identify whether the expected underlying constructs emerged. In total, 12 factors were identified.

3.2.2. Identifying themes

Of the 12 factors identified, a reliability analysis found that Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 demonstrated an alpha score greater than 0.7, meaning they were an accurate measure of the underlying theme and could be used as a composite measure for analysis (Nunnally, J. C., 1978). Factor 5 had a reliability score of 0.67 (0.03 below the generally accepted cut-off point). However, due to the marginal difference, the factor was deemed sufficiently reliable to be used for further analysis.

Each factor was named by cross-referencing the questions that identified it with the relevant training material. A brief description of each factor is presented in Table 3.10 and full details can be found in Appendix F.

Table 3.10: Follow-up factor breakdown

Factor	Reliability	Description
1. Attitudes to vulnerability	0.85	Items relating to attitudes towards vulnerable people and the role of the police in dealing with vulnerability
2. Familiarity with contributors to vulnerability	0.75	Items relating to how familiar respondents are with underlying risk factors and behaviours that contribute to vulnerability, eg, trauma and ACEs
3. Model use	0.70	Items relating to how respondents use models to help them deal with vulnerable people
4. Overall approach to vulnerability	0.74	Items that incorporate multiple areas of vulnerability (eg, use of THRIVE and familiarity of the 5Fs) demonstrating a holistic approach to dealing with vulnerability
5. Communication skills	0.67	Items relating to a range of communication approaches and tactics to be employed when engaging with vulnerable people

3.2.3. Macro-level impact of the training

To investigate the impact of the training at a macro-level, the composite mean scores of each factor were compared between the control and intervention group. A positive mean difference indicates that the intervention group reported higher levels of agreement with the training content, hence, the training appeared to have had the desired effect.

Table 3.11 shows that four of the five factors displayed a positive significant difference between the control and intervention groups. Significant results are highlighted in green (see Appendix J for the full results).

Table 3.11: Follow-up factor t-test results

Factor	Mean Difference	Significant ?	Cohen's d	Effect Size
1. Attitudes to vulnerability	+0.16	No	NA	NA
2. Familiarity with contributors to vulnerability	+0.73	Yes***	0.84	Large
3. Model use	+0.55	Yes**	0.46	Small - Medium
4. Overall approach to vulnerability	+0.64	Yes***	0.75	Medium - Large
5. Communication skills	+0.39	Yes*	0.41	Small - Medium

Significance level = * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Factor 2, 'familiarity with contributors to vulnerability', Factor 3, 'model use', and Factor 4, 'overall approach to vulnerability', demonstrated a positive, highly significant difference between the responses from the control and intervention groups. The magnitude of the difference was considered meaningful in each case, as all three factors differed in the expected direction by over half a mark. The observed difference was particularly large for Factors 2 and 4. Factor 5, 'communication skills', also demonstrated a significant difference between the control and intervention groups, although this was the smallest mean change (0.39) and was the least significant of all the significant factors. Responses for Factor 1 showed no significant difference between the control and intervention group. It is likely that, because the mean attitude score in the control group was the second highest of all factors for Factor 1 (5.39), it was more difficult to distinguish a difference between the intervention and control group (due to a high base level of positive attitudes). However, the mean score for Factor 5 was the highest in the control group (5.45) and a difference was still identified. This indicates that there are other reasons influencing the impact on attitudes that shall be discussed below.

Of the 13 questions in the follow-up survey that were not significant individually and did not contribute to a reliable factor (see Appendix K), seven were connected to rapport building and four to understanding the impact of trauma. This suggests that some aspects of the training did not have a sustained impact on knowledge and attitudes.

Overall, the results from the follow-up survey indicate that the training had a positive longer-term impact on frontline officers' and staff members' ability to identify and manage vulnerability, specifically in relation to understanding the contributors to vulnerability and the overall approach to managing vulnerability.

An ANOVA (analysis of variance test) concluded that the demographic variables of gender, age, role and length of service did not cause any significant differences in the responses to the factors. Therefore, all participants responded in the same way to the factors regardless of their demographic characteristics.

3.3. Interviews and observations

Eleven interviews were conducted with eight trainees and three trainers. Two trainers were from West Mercia Police and one was an associate of the College of Policing. Two observations were carried out during the training to assess the style of delivery, learner engagement and the quality of key learning points. The trainees held a variety of different roles, as outlined in Table 3.12.

Table 3.12: Roles of trainee interviewees

	West Mercia	Warwickshire	Total
PSCO	1	0	1
Constable	2	0	2
Sergeant	4	0	4
Inspector	0	1	1
Total	7	1	8

3.3.1. Key themes

Following thematic analysis of the 11 interview write-ups, a number of key themes were identified, which are depicted below (Figure 3.1). Each theme will be discussed in detail in this chapter.

Figure 3.1: Main themes identified in the thematic analysis



3.3.2. Force context

Prior to the training programme, West Mercia Police had numerous initiatives in place that aimed to improve police responses to vulnerability and at-risk individuals. A number of trainees had already received vulnerability training as part of their Inspector training programme, the Specialist Child Abuse Investigator Development Programme (SCAIDP), or from their force Single Point Of Contact (SPOC). However, trainees commented that the nature of this training was not as comprehensive as the College’s Vulnerability Training Programme. Additionally, West Mercia promotes the strapline ‘protecting the vulnerable’, which is widely advertised across the force. All of the trainees interviewed identified that they have daily contact with vulnerable people.

3.3.3. Trainer preparation

The trainers attended a 'Train the Trainer' day as part of the preparation for delivery. There were mixed views about the effectiveness of the day; two of the three trainers found the day useful and informative, but the third, who was more experienced at delivering vulnerability training, stated the day was rushed and poorly prepared the trainers for their role.

All the trainers agreed that the delivery materials were not provided to them far enough in advance to sufficiently familiarise themselves with the content. Additionally, most felt they were not introduced to their co-trainer in a timely enough manner, which impacted their ability to effectively collaborate and plan their approach.

3.3.4. Delivery

On the whole, trainees felt that the training was well delivered. In some cases, the trainers shared personal experiences of their own vulnerability, which was considered courageous and effective by other trainees.

The trainers identified several issues regarding the delivery. Firstly, there were too many objectives to successfully deliver in the short timescale, which meant that too little time was dedicated to each topic. Despite this, the trainers struggled to identify any content that could be removed without damaging the overall impact of the training. One trainer suggested that the 'Finkelhor' content might be appropriate to remove, due to its high level of technicality. To maximise the impact of the training, most trainers felt that more time should be dedicated to discussion around the case studies.

Secondly, the trainers received ambiguous instructions regarding who was required to deliver the training. The College trainer delivered the majority of the content in most sessions and the force trainer typically delivered about 10 per cent of content. However, the intention was for the training to be delivered equally by the two trainers. Additionally, one force trainer identified that the College trainer deviated from the agreed training plan and content. Observation data also reported that the College trainers led most of the day.

Finally, the trainers disagreed about the effectiveness of training groups that incorporated staff of differing levels of seniority. One trainer felt it was important to have mixed groups as it enabled more senior staff to hear the views of junior staff, whereas another thought that this inhibited the discussion and learning.

3.3.5. Content

Overall, the trainees were positive about the content of the training. Each section is discussed below.

Introduction video

The introduction video was not well received by the majority of trainees. It was perceived as patronising and thought to set a negative tone for the day. This view differs from the results of the pilot evaluation, where, on the whole, the three forces responded positively to the introduction video. It is possible that West Mercia Police force's negative perceptions are an anomaly, or due to contextual factors at the local level.

Definition

On the whole, the new definition was well received and most trainees found the reformulation helpful and refreshing. Some trainees commented that the definition has become broader in recent years, resulting in more people being categorised as vulnerable and, consequently, increasing the scope of the police's work. Trainers agreed that the definition was an appropriate start to the day.

Neuroscience

The neuroscience content was very well received by all trainees. It was perceived as helpful, interesting and informative and trainees commented that it was especially impactful since they had not received similar training before. One trainer agreed that this section was particularly effective, but another felt that the content was too technical and presented in too much detail.

The 5 Fs

The section on the 5 Fs was also well received and the majority of trainees found it informative and helpful. One trainer suggested that more time could be spent discussing this content.

Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)

Most trainees remembered the content about ACEs and thought it was informative and helpful. However, some felt that the trainer digressed during this section, meaning the content lacked relevance to their role. The trainers thought that the ACEs content was indispensable but should be linked to early intervention to make it relevant for the trainees.

All trainers felt that the training material did not include enough content to facilitate effective delivery.

Case studies

The case studies, and subsequent discussion, were considered particularly effective by both trainees and trainers. The 'Hollie' case study was especially well received as it allowed trainees to fully comprehend the situation and empathise with a vulnerable person. Some trainees thought that the case study was particularly impactful since it drew attention to police failings. However, others felt that the case study wasn't relevant to them and unnecessarily highlighted failings. The 'Samia' case study was considered less impactful, and several trainees could not recall it. Regardless, most trainees thought it was helpful to understand these issues, even if they were not particularly relevant to them.

Most trainees thought that the subsequent facilitated discussion was a useful learning tool and one trainer stated that more time should be dedicated to this discussion to maximise impact. Observation data reported that the trainers facilitated the discussion well.

Communication skills

Most trainees could not remember any specific content on communication skills, and those who did noted that it was rather unexceptional. The trainers felt that the exercise was patronising, confusing and poorly received by the trainees, and one trainee found the exercise bizarre. Observation data noted that the communication roadblocks exercise was omitted in one session and delivered poorly in the other.

Resilience

All trainees were able to recall the content on resilience, but many thought that this was not covered in enough detail. Although it was useful, more time should have been dedicated to it, since it is an important topic for police officers and staff. Some trainees received a pamphlet, while others did not.

Risk

Nearly all trainees remembered, and found helpful, the content on managing risk and risk models. Some trainees working in the vulnerability field were already acquainted with the content and used this time to reinforce or strengthen their knowledge. Despite this, one trainer thought that this part of the session required more depth; only a small minority of trainees remembered the content on tactics and legislation.

Observation data reported that some content was covered briefly or, in some cases, not at all. Topics included; legislation, risk, partnership working, ACEs, grooming and exploitation, investigative mind-set, and safeguarding.

3.3.6. Impact

All the trainees perceived the training to have impacted them in some way, with many commenting that the inexperienced members of staff would have found the programme particularly useful (for example, those who were new to the service, those who didn't often deal with vulnerable people, or non-specialists). The training showed signs of impressing on officers and staff – one officer mentioned actively gathering more information about incidents post training than previously, and an officer working in safeguarding commented that, since the training, more frontline staff were asking questions about vulnerability.

3.3.7. Potential developments

While, on the whole, trainees felt that the programme was a positive learning experience, both trainers and trainees identified a number of improvements that would increase the value and effectiveness of the training.

- Due to the intensive nature of the training programme, reduce the amount of content or spread the training over two days.
- To maximise the shared learning during the training, increase the time dedicated to facilitated discussions.
- Modify or remove the introduction video, since it set a negative tone for the day.
- Due to the pertinence of the topic, spend more time discussing resilience and the wellbeing and mental health of police officers and staff.
- Trainers in particular felt that there is a need to improve the communication exercises as they were confusing and not well received.

3.3.8. Overall general impressions

Overall, all trainees acknowledged that vulnerability training is essential in the current climate, and the majority found it a positive, timely and educational experience. A few trainees commented that it was the 'best bit of training' they have had in a while. In particular, the case studies and the subsequent facilitated discussion were thought to be particularly impactful. In terms of improvements, some trainees thought that the training should have covered fewer topics or been spread over two days, as it felt rushed. One

trainee also perceived an undertone of 'police blaming'. The trainers felt that, overall, the training was received fairly well. However, they all agreed that there was too much content to cover in one day and the interactive elements, which were considered most effective, suffered because of this.

4. Discussion

4.1. Immediate impact

A comparison of the pre and post survey scores shows that, on all but two questions, there was a significant increase in the expected direction: trainees reported more of the desired knowledge, attitudes and confidence, in line with the training content, immediately after the training delivery.

Notably, two themes were identified in the pre/post survey data: Factor 1, 'attitudes to vulnerability', and Factor 2, 'confidence in dealing with vulnerability'. Factor 1 incorporated the survey items on officer and staff perceptions of vulnerable people and the role of the police in dealing with vulnerability. Following the training, there was a moderate attitudinal shift, with trainees demonstrating more positive attitudes to vulnerability and vulnerable people. This finding is noteworthy, since the training programme aimed to break down barriers and improve police attitudes. In the short-term, this objective appears successful.

Factor 2 comprised the survey items that identified trainee confidence in dealing with a wide range of issues relating to vulnerability. Immediately after the training, there was a large and meaningful increase in the confidence levels of trainees. This indicates that the training helped police officers and staff to feel more confident in their own ability to support vulnerable people.

Two open-ended questions tested the extent to which trainee knowledge improved following the training. When comparing the pre and post scores, both questions demonstrated a highly significant increase, which represented a medium to large increase in knowledge. However, it is probable that these findings are influenced by the accessibility of the training materials during the completion of the surveys in some cases. As such, the results must be treated with some scepticism. Better supervision of the survey completion is required if this programme is repeated.

The pre/post survey results provide strong evidence that the training had an immediate and positive impact on improving the attitudes and confidence of police officers and staff, indicating that the training was effective, and met its objectives, in the short term.

4.2. Sustained impact

The follow-up survey, distributed one month after the training, was designed to investigate the longer-term impact of the programme. Trainees, and a comparison control group, were asked a series of questions to assess the impact of the training on attitudes, knowledge and skills, one month after its completion.

Five factors were identified, allowing analysis to take place at a macro-level. These were: Factor 1, 'attitudes to vulnerability'; Factor 2, 'familiarity with contributors to vulnerability'; Factor 3, 'model use'; Factor 4, 'overall approach to vulnerability' and; Factor 5, 'communication skills'. Responses from four of the five factors were found to differ significantly between the control and intervention group.

The greatest difference between the control and intervention group was seen for Factor 2, which measured the participants' self-assessed familiarity with several underlying risk factors and behaviours found to contribute to increasing the risk of harm, such as perpetrator motivations, adverse childhood events (ACEs) and response to trauma. The difference between the control and intervention group for this factor was the largest across all the factors in the follow-up survey, demonstrating that trainees felt substantially more familiar with various facets of vulnerability compared to those who had not received any training.

Factor 5 comprised the questions designed to assess trainee knowledge of the communication skills and questioning styles that help to elicit information from vulnerable people at the initial point of contact. It is assumed that improving these skills increases the opportunity to identify issues that put people at a greater risk of harm. This factor showed a significant difference between the control and intervention group, but the size of the effect was small. Furthermore, seven of the 13 items in the follow-up survey that were found to have a non-significant difference (between the control and intervention group) related to communication and the use of empathy and rapport building. Evidence from the interviews also highlighted that some trainees could not recall the communication content, while others found the exercises confusing.

Together these findings suggest that, while there is some evidence of communication skills improving post training, further development is required to maximise this effect. Improving communication skills was a key objective of the programme because, during development workshops with representatives from third sector organisations, the use of empathy and rapport building were commonly raised as skills that had the potential to improve the police response to vulnerability.

Factors 3 and 4 contained questions that aimed to measure the extent to which trainees apply vulnerability-focused approaches in their daily roles. Analysis of both factors demonstrated that members of the intervention group were more likely to use these approaches compared to the control group. The magnitude of the difference was particularly large for Factor 4. This finding is pertinent, since the programme aimed to refresh the participants' knowledge of these approaches and demonstrate how their use in practice could support the management of vulnerable individuals. During the interviews, participants noted that they found training on the practical application of such tools especially useful.

While Factors 2, 3, 4 and 5 showed sustained impact at the follow-up, the initial changes in attitudes to vulnerability, which had been identified immediately after training, were not sustained at follow-up. Factor 1 (a composite of questions about attitudes to vulnerable people and the role of the police in dealing with them) was the only factor that did not show a significant difference in the follow-up survey. This result, however, is unsurprising as it reinforces the findings from the [pilot evaluation](#), which also detected no longer-term change in attitudes. Both findings can be attributed to the stable nature of attitudes and subsequent difficulty that arises when trying to shift attitudes during a one-day training programme. The interviews highlighted that West Mercia Police already have vulnerability high on their strategic agenda, and they will soon release a vulnerability phone application to support officers and staff (accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week). Comprehensive initiatives such as this will likely support longer-term attitudinal change by addressing the culture of the force as a whole.

Results also indicated that, although trainees claimed to have greater familiarity with the underlying factors and behaviours that can increase the risk of vulnerability (including the impact of trauma), they did not appear to implement this in their actions. Further investigation showed that five of 13 items that were non-significant or did not fall into a factor related to understanding the impact of trauma and applying this when dealing with vulnerable people. While concrete conclusions cannot be made solely on these results, the findings tentatively suggest that further development of this element of training is required. This will ensure the practical responses that underpin the basis of trauma-informed working can be improved. A review of the training content and/or delivery method for this section may be appropriate in this case.

4.3. Perceptions of training

For the most part, the training was well received by the trainees in terms of delivery and content. The content was generally considered informative and useful, although it was highlighted that there could have been greater focus on the self-care of officers and staff. The trainees were particularly positive about the facilitated discussions and sharing of personal experiences, both by the trainees and trainers. Trainers affirmed the effectiveness of the discussions and recommend more time be dedicated to them in future. Evidence has shown that high levels of interpersonal interaction during training increases its long-term effectiveness (Bennett et al, 2003), as such, increasing the time dedicated to facilitated discussion will likely be beneficial.

A number of issues were identified that were perceived to inhibit the successful delivery of the training. Firstly, trainees and trainers agreed that there was too much content to be thoroughly covered in a single day, which meant that too little time was dedicated to each topic. Observers confirmed that trainers only briefly dealt with some of the sections. Similar concerns were highlighted during the pilot evaluation. Arguably, the inability to deliver the training content in the intended amount of detail impacted the effectiveness of the training. Consideration about the volume of content and/or the length of the training programme is required in future to mitigate the risk of decreased effectiveness due to cognitive overload.

Secondly, an issue arose concerning the divide of training delivery between the College and force trainer. It was intended for the force trainer to contribute valuable local insight (such as information about the force's strategic approach to vulnerability and initiatives, local partner agencies, and discussion points specific to the local context) but, in reality, the College trainer delivered the majority of content. Better communication is required in future to ensure that the specialist input from both trainers is maximised. The training material is complex and, although the 'Train the Trainer' day was deemed more effective than in the pilot, trainers also commented that they would have liked the material earlier. It is important that those delivering the training in future are properly prepared and have attended a College training day.

Finally, the reaction to the introduction video was fairly negative. Trainees perceived it as patronising and it was felt to significantly lower the tone of the day. This may be a local issue, since it was not raised in the pilot study and a senior officer connected to West Mercia Police introduced the video on this occasion. In future, it is necessary to assess the impact of such local connections and consider involving an independent vulnerability expert to introduce the training.

Overall, all trainees acknowledged that the programme had, or would have, some kind of positive impact on them and, in particular, on their frontline colleagues who were inexperienced or non-specialists. The training provided some with the opportunity to reinforce or strengthen knowledge, while others gained confidence in, and learnt new approaches to, dealing with vulnerable people.

4.4. Conclusions

The evaluation of trainee surveys and interviews demonstrated that vulnerability training can facilitate an immediate increase in attitudes, confidence and knowledge. Furthermore, observed increases in knowledge and skills show evidence of being sustained one month after training.

It was also demonstrated that trainees display greater familiarity with factors that contribute to vulnerability, and with the use of approaches and tools to help manage vulnerability, than of those who have not received vulnerability training. In addition, the training demonstrated a larger immediate and sustained positive change in knowledge and skills than was observed in the pilot evaluation. The attitudinal change observed immediately after training was not found to have been sustained. This finding is not surprising given the stable nature of attitudes, which makes them somewhat resistant to change. To specifically target attitude change, a top-down and far-reaching approach is required – without this, it is unlikely that a single day's training will affect attitudes in the long term.

The training was, on the whole, perceived as well-designed, with useful and informative content. In particular, the case studies and facilitated discussion were very well received. Trainees valued the real-life examples of vulnerability in the policing context and the opportunity to thoroughly discuss these, and their personal experiences, with their peers. Increasing interactivity and facilitating more discussions will add further value to the training in future.

For future delivery, it is also necessary to improve the elements of the programme that relate to communication skills, the impact of trauma, and trauma-informed working. These elements need to better illustrate the suitable approaches that officers should use when dealing with people who are potentially suffering from the impact of trauma.

Training preparation should likewise be improved to ensure that trainers are fully prepared and qualified to deliver the course, and allow for better coordination of the co-delivery by the two specialist trainers.

4.5. Limitations

Finally, it is important to note a number of limitations of the evaluation. Firstly, the environment where the pre and post surveys were completed was not adequately controlled. An investigation discovered that a small minority of respondents achieved full marks on knowledge questions in the pre survey, which suggests that they may have had access to training materials while completing it. This is damaging for the evaluation because these individuals could not demonstrate evidence of learning, even if learning took place. In addition, during an observation it was noted that some trainees had access to training material while completing the post survey. This is reinforced by the data, as a small number of respondents scored full marks on the post survey knowledge questions. It is possible that these trainees could recall all the required information, but it is perhaps more likely that responses were copied directly from the training material. For this reason, caution should be taken when claiming that the training programme facilitates an increase in knowledge. However, the data suggests that this effect was minimal – only a small number of respondents scored full marks on the post but not the pre test. This indicates that the results do demonstrate a real increase in knowledge.

Secondly, the roll-out evaluation only took place in one force, as opposed to three forces in the pilot evaluation. By evaluating one force, there is a reduced ability to generalise the results to the police as a whole, due to potential underlying contextual factors unduly influencing the results. This is a particular limitation to this study, as West Mercia Police has focused considerably on vulnerability in recent years and may be atypical in some respects. The survey data indicated that the respondents' base level knowledge of vulnerability was high, which limited the degree of improvement that could be observed and measured by the surveys. Therefore, the impact of the training may differ in forces with lower levels of base knowledge, as the ability to measure an increase of knowledge, attitudes and skill would be enhanced.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings from the vulnerability training roll-out evaluation, and excluding any recommendations already provided in the pilot evaluation, the following additional recommendations made were:

5.1. Delivery

- Facilitate effective trainer preparation by providing all training materials sufficiently in advance of the training.
- Review and develop the interactive exercises included – specifically those relating to the communication skills.
- Consider reducing the volume of content and the number of objectives hoping to be achieved in a single day.
- Maximise the potential for learning by increasing the time dedicated to facilitated discussion.

5.2. Content

- Allow more time for content and discussion about resilience and self-care for police officers and staff.
- Review the introduction video to identify any potentially patronising content with a view to remove content perceived to negatively impact the trainees' attitude.
- Review the content specifically relating to developing empathy and rapport building and those related to responding to those affected by trauma for clarity, depth and audience suitability.

5.3. Embedding learning

- Incorporate force vulnerability initiatives into the training to emphasise the strategic priority at a local level and support the ongoing application and embedding of new knowledge and behaviours.

6. Bibliography

Arthur, W., Bennett, W., Edens, P., and Bell, S. (2003) 'Effectiveness of training in organizations: A meta-analysis of design and evaluation features', *Journal Of Applied Psychology*, 88, 2, pp. 234-245.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York, NY: Routledge Academic.

College of Policing (2019) Evaluation of vulnerability training for frontline police officers and staff.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wheller, L., Quinton, P., Fildes, A., and Mills, A. (2013) The Greater Manchester Police Procedural Justice Training Experiment (<http://library.college.police.uk/docs/college-of-policing/Technical-Report.pdf>).

7. Appendix

A: Pre/post survey

Introduction

We are conducting an evaluation of the pilot training to test its effectiveness. Please help us by filling out this short questionnaire – it should take just a few minutes of your time and will enable us to understand the impact of the training and help us develop it further for future participants.

- All completed questionnaires are confidential and anonymous
- Participation is voluntary
- No individual responses will be seen outside of IES (our independent evaluators)
- Only a summary of responses are reported
- The questionnaires are evaluating the training not your knowledge

Please complete the questionnaire and hand it to the trainer, who will return all completed questionnaires to IES (addressed envelopes have been provided).

For the following statements please say the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

1. When responding to a crime, police officers should prioritise gathering evidence over reassuring the victim

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

2. I will never leave a vulnerable person without giving them details of who else can help them

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

3. Being concerned about building relationships should not be a big part of a police officer's job

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

4. It is vital for me to ask difficult and unwelcomed questions, even if they make me uncomfortable

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

5. Having strong feelings in response to a victim's situation is an inevitable and normal part of policing

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

6. Some victims of crime are more deserving of a good service than others

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

7. It is difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

8. Assessing a person's capability to support themselves is a very important part of my job

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

9. I will always give a victim an opportunity to tell me how they would like an incident resolved

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

10. I should not be spending time on a person or situation unless a crime has been committed

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

11. It is important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

12. If a victim of a crime won't help themselves there is not much I can do to help them

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

13. For every situation I deal with, I will continually assess if there is more going on than first reported

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

14. Some vulnerable people do little to deserve the help of the police

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

15. It's a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

16. Some of the victims that I work with could behave better if they really wanted to

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

17. Repeat exposure to adverse experiences in childhood reduces ability for rational thinking and learning

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree

18. What is the definition of 'vulnerability' in the context of policing?

19. Name the personal and situational factors you should consider when determining if someone is vulnerable to harm

		Very confident	Confident	Neither confident nor unconfident	Unconfident	Very unconfident
20.	How confident are you that you know where you can refer vulnerable people to in your area?					
21.	How confident are you in assessing if an individual is at risk from harm?					

		Very confident	Confident	Neither confident nor unconfident	Unconfident	Very unconfident
22.	How confident are you that you understand how to work in a trauma informed way?					
23.	How confident are you that you could recognise the effects of trauma in yourself and colleagues?					
24.	How confident are you with the prevention and disruption options for victims and perpetrators?					
25.	How confident are you that you would be supported to take more time when dealing with a vulnerable person?					

Demographic questions

To evaluate the training materials we would like to compare the answers provided before the training with those provided afterwards. So that we can match your responses we are asking two questions that we will use to create a unique identifier (which will be solely used for this purpose).

1. Please provide your year of birth

— — — —

2. Please provide the last three digits of your phone number

— — —

We would also like to capture a few details about you and your role to assist with the analysis – these details will not be disclosed in the report or to the police forces taking part and are solely to be used for our evaluation of the training.

3. Please give your gender (please tick the appropriate box below):

Response	Please tick one box only
Male	
Female	
Other	
Prefer not to say	

4. Please select your age group by ticking the appropriate box below:

Response	Please tick one box only
18-24	
25-34	
35-44	
45-54	
55 or over	

5. Please select your current role (please tick one box only):

Response	Please tick one box only
Response	
Neighbourhood	
PCSO	
Uniform supervisor	
Investigations	
Custody	
Control room	
Other	

6. Please enter your length of service in the police force.

Response (years)	Please tick one box only
0 - 5	
6 - 10	
11 - 15	
16 - 20	
21 - 25	
26 - 30	
31 +	

B: Follow-up survey

Your force has volunteered to pilot some training developed by the College of Policing. To ensure that the training is effective the College of Policing has employed the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) to independently evaluate it. You are being sent this questionnaire as part of the evaluation, it does not matter if you have or have not received the training; your views are equally valuable to us.

Please help us by completing this short questionnaire – it should take no longer than ten minutes of your time. Your participation is incredibly valuable and will directly impact the delivery and national roll-out of the training. Thank you for taking the time to contribute.

- All completed questionnaires are confidential and anonymous
- Participation is voluntary
- No individual responses will be seen outside of IES (our independent evaluators)
- Only a summary of responses are reported
- The questionnaires are evaluating the training not your knowledge

Please navigate through this survey using the buttons at the bottom of each page.

Reset: use the reset button at the bottom of each page if necessary to reset the answers on that page. This will only reset the answers to questions on that page, not to any previous pages. Save: you can save a partially completed questionnaire and return to complete it. To do this, use the Save button at the bottom of the screen. A prompt will ask for your email address and we will then send you a link to complete the questionnaire. If you close the window instead of using the save button, a link to complete the questionnaire will not be sent to you and you would need to start from the beginning to submit a response to us.

Submit: send your completed questionnaire to us using the submit button on the last page.

Have you completed a vulnerability training course?

- Yes
- No

Are you aware if any of your colleagues you regularly work with attended the training?

- Yes
- No

Have they shared any of the training content or learning with you in conversation or otherwise?

Yes

No

Questions

Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements from Strongly Disagree (1) 2 3 4 5 6 to Strongly Agree (7).

I frequently apply the National Decision Model to assess risk

I often use the THRIVE approach when dealing with vulnerable people

I am familiar with the full range of intervention options available to me under the Public Protection Tactical Menu of Options (PPTMO)

The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) model is helpful to increase my understanding of why people are vulnerable to harm

I frequently use the RARA model when managing risk

If someone is frustrated with you, it can help the situation to tell them you realise they are frustrated

It doesn't help to tell a victim who's in distress that you recognise they are upset

I can build rapport with victims by saying I'm sorry to hear about what's occurred

My job is made easier when I tell victims I can see what they are going through

It is important to lead the conversation to get the best quality information

I make sure I am planning what to say next whilst a person is talking to me

I should focus all my attention on a conversation even if I risk missing something going on around me

Asking open questions is often too time-consuming and leads to irrelevant information

It is not helpful to offer a vulnerable person advice and guidance during a conversation

We can all be at risk of becoming vulnerable

A person's past does not have much bearing on their current situation

When thinking about risk I look beyond the immediate person to others who might be affected

I utilise the full range of powers available to prevent harm being caused in the future

Understanding why people are difficult does not help me do my job well

It is the role of partner agencies, not the police, to support vulnerable people to build confidence in their own abilities

I feel empowered to spend as much time with a vulnerable person as I feel necessary

I should keep questioning limited to the current matter being dealt with

A frontline response officer should only focus on the circumstances of the incident they are attending

Some of the victims that I work with could behave better if they really wanted to

It is important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it

If a victim of a crime won't help themselves there is not much I can do to help them

Some victims of crime are more deserving of a good service than others

It's a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people

Some vulnerable people do little to deserve the help of the police

It is difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free

Negative early life experiences affect people's response to situations

Due to the significance of traumatic situations you are able to recall detailed memories

How a person is treated is more important than the end result

During a traumatic event, the brain protects you against long-term effects

People will always behave the same way when responding to trauma

Understanding the potential impact of trauma helps me to deal with situations more effectively

Please indicate how familiar you are with the following factors when dealing with vulnerable people from Not at all familiar (1) 2 3 to Extremely familiar (4)

The impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences

The impact of trauma on victims

The 5F (friend, fight, flight, freeze, flop) responses to overwhelming threat or trauma

The impact of traumatic incidents on my own wellbeing

The reasons perpetrators are motivated to commit crimes

Demographic questions

We would like to capture a few details about you and your role to assist with the analysis – these details will not be disclosed in the report or to the police forces taking part and are solely to be used for our evaluation of the training and how people found it.

Please give your gender (please select the appropriate box below):

- Male
- Female
- Other
- Prefer not to say

Please select your age group in the appropriate box below:

- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55 or over

Please select your current role:

- Response
- Neighbourhood
- PCSO
- Uniform supervisor
- Investigations
- Custody
- Control room
- Other

Please enter your length of service in the police force.

- 0 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 16 - 20 years
- 21 - 25 years
- 26 - 30 years
- 31 + years

C: Observation record form

Observation Record Form

Session Title	Method for delivery	Observations on delivery of training	Observations on responses to training
Objectives and national drivers			
National drivers			
PPTMO			
Public protection strands			
Personal and situational factors			
Karen Manners video 1			
Definition of vulnerability			
Personal and situational factors exercise			
Karen Manners video 2			
Infographic			
Risky situations			
Response to trauma			
Role of the amygdala			
ACEs			

Cycle of abuse			
Perpetrators			
Motivation			
Targeting			
Grooming and exploitation			
Case studies			
Case study 1			
Case study 2			
Effective communication			
Roadblocks exercise			
Effective communications			
Empowered decision-making			
Building resilience in individuals			
Effective response			
Legislation			
Investigative – mindset			
Professional curiosity			

Risk			
NDM			
THRIVE, RARA			
Partnership working			
Revisit PPTMO			
Safeguarding			
Scenario exercises			
Case studies			
Case study 1			
Case study 2			
Self-care			
Looking after yourself			
Oscar Kilo			
Summing up			
Look beyond the obvious			
Self-reflection			
Overall summary			

D: Pre/post survey full results

Table 7.1: Pre/post survey t-test results²

	Question³	Pre mean	Post mean	Mean difference	t statistic	Sig. (2-tailed)
Q1	*When responding to a crime, police officers should NOT prioritise gathering evidence over reassuring the victim	4.31	4.94	0.63	3.78	0.000
Q2	I will never leave a vulnerable person without giving them details of who else can help them	6.20	6.19	-0.01	-0.08	0.938
Q3	*Being concerned about building relationships SHOULD be a big part of a police officer's job	5.21	5.74	0.53	3.48	0.001
Q4	It is vital for me to ask difficult and unwelcomed questions even if they make me uncomfortable	5.85	6.17	0.32	2.99	0.004
Q5	Having strong feelings in response to a victim's situation is an inevitable and normal part of policing	5.29	5.20	-0.09	-0.80	0.424
Q6	*Some victims of crime are NOT more deserving of a good service than others	5.11	5.59	0.48	2.90	0.005
Q7	*It is NOT difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free	4.43	4.96	0.53	3.83	0.000

² Questions highlighted in green demonstrated a significant difference in the expected direction between the pre and post scores, whilst non-highlighted questions were not significant.

³ Questions marked with an asterisk have been altered post survey for ease of interpretation. Words in capitals have been added for the purpose of interpreting the results; these were not included in the original questions.

Q8	Assessing a person's capability to support themselves is a very important part of my job	5.62	6.10	0.48	5.00	0.000
Q9	I will always give a victim an opportunity to tell me how they would like an incident resolved	5.81	5.92	0.11	0.90	0.490
Q10	*I SHOULD be spending time on a person or situation unless a crime has been committed	5.89	6.14	0.25	2.70	0.008
Q11	*It is NOT important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it	5.17	5.86	0.69	6.18	0.000
Q12	*If a victim of a crime won't help themselves THERE IS much I can do to help them	5.48	5.89	0.42	4.13	0.000
Q13	For every situation I deal with, I will continually assess if there is more going on than first reported	5.81	6.21	0.40	3.76	0.000
Q14	*Some vulnerable people do NOT DO little to deserve the help of the police	5.64	5.92	0.28	2.48	0.015
Q15	*It's NOT a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people	6.05	6.25	0.20	2.22	0.028
Q16	*Some of the victims that I work with could NOT behave better if they really wanted to	3.44	4.20	0.76	5.24	0.000

Q17	Repeat exposure to adverse experiences in childhood reduces ability for rational thinking and learning	4.70	5.53	0.83	5.03	0.000
Q18	What is the definition of vulnerability in the context of policing?	3.00	4.71	1.71	4.12	0.000
Q19	Name the personal and situational factors you should consider when determining if someone is vulnerable to harm	5.04	9.54	4.50	6.22	0.000
Q20	How confident are you that you know where you can refer vulnerable people to in your area?	3.61	4.15	0.54	6.89	0.000
Q21	How confident are you in assessing if an individual is at risk from harm?	3.83	4.18	0.35	4.79	0.000
Q22	How confident are you that you understand how to work in a trauma informed way?	3.09	4.07	0.98	10.64	0.000
Q23	How confident are you that you could recognise the effects of trauma in yourself and colleagues?	3.45	4.08	0.63	7.42	0.000
Q24	How confident are you with the prevention and disruption options for victims and perpetrators?	3.29	3.97	0.68	9.40	0.000
Q25	How confident are you that you would be supported to take more time when dealing with a vulnerable person?	3.29	3.80	0.51	4.95	0.000

E: Pre/post factor results

Table 7.2: Pre/post factor t-test results⁴

	Pre mean	Post mean	Mean difference	t statistic	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attitudes to vulnerability	5.15	5.61	0.45	0.00	0.00
Confidence in dealing with vulnerability	3.43	4.04	0.61	0.00	0.00

⁴ Questions highlighted in green demonstrated a significant difference in the expected direction between the pre and post scores, whilst non-highlighted questions were not significant.

F: Pre/post factor analysis

Table 7.3: Factor analysis – pre/post survey

Theme	Question ⁵	Alpha reliability
Attitudes towards vulnerability	<p>*It is NOT difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free.</p> <p>*I SHOULD be spending time on a person or situation unless a crime has been committed.</p> <p>*It is NOT important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it.</p> <p>*If a victim of a crime won't help themselves THERE IS much I can do to help them.</p> <p>*Some vulnerable people do NOT DO little to deserve the help of the police.</p> <p>*It's NOT a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people.</p> <p>*Some of the victims that I work with could NOT behave better if they really wanted to.</p>	0.82
Confidence in dealing with vulnerability	<p>How confident are you that you know where you can refer vulnerable people to in your area?</p> <p>How confident are you in assessing if an individual is at risk from harm?</p> <p>How confident are you that you understand how to work in a trauma informed way?</p> <p>How confident are you that you could recognise the effects of trauma in yourself and colleagues?</p> <p>How confident are you with the prevention and disruption options for victims and perpetrators?</p> <p>How confident are you that you would be supported to take more time when dealing with a vulnerable person?</p>	0.80

⁵ Questions marked with an asterisk have been altered post survey for ease of interpretation. Words in capitals have been added for the purpose of interpreting the results; these were not included in the original questions.

G: Follow-up survey demographic details

Table 7.4: Follow-up survey control and intervention group demographic breakdown

Demographic	Group		Intervention group	Control group	Chi-square value	Sig.(2-sided)
Gender	Male	Count	58	28	3.48	.18
		Per cent	63.70	49.10		
	Female	Count	31	26		
		Per cent	34.10	45.60		
	Prefer not to say	Count	2	3		
		Per cent	2.20	5.30		
Total	Count	91	57			
Age	18-24	Count	2	1	3.44	.49
		Per cent	2.20	1.70		
	25-34	Count	10	9		
		Per cent	11.00	15.50		
	35-44	Count	35	17		
		Per cent	38.50	29.30		
	45-54	Count	32	18		
		Per cent	35.20	31.00		
	55 or over	Count	12	13		
		Per cent	13.20	22.40		
	Total	Count	91	58		
	Role	Response	Count	16		
Per cent			17.60	13.80		
Neighbourhood		Count	15	3		
		Per cent	16.50	5.20		
PCSO		Count	10	3		
		Per cent	11.00	5.20		
Uniform Supervisor		Count	4	0		
		Per cent	4.40	0.00		
Investigations		Count	14	16		
		Per cent	15.40	27.60		
Custody		Count	2	1		

Evaluation of National Roll-out of Police Vulnerability Training

		Per cent	2.20	1.70		
	Control Room	Count	1	0		
		Per cent	1.10	0.00		
	Other	Count	29	27		
		Per cent	31.90	46.60		
	Total	Count	91	58		
Length of service	0 - 5 years	Count	11	7	2.92	.82
		Per cent	12.00	12.10		
	6 - 10 years	Count	11	11		
		Per cent	12.00	19.00		
	11 - 15 years	Count	20	12		
		Per cent	21.70	20.70		
	16 - 20 years	Count	21	10		
		Per cent	22.80	17.20		
	21 - 25 years	Count	12	8		
		Per cent	13.00	13.80		
	26 - 30 years	Count	12	5		
		Per cent	13.00	8.60		
	31 + years	Count	5	5		
		Per cent	5.40	8.60		
	Total	Count	92	58		

H: Follow-up survey item results

Table 7.5: Follow-up survey t-test results⁶

Item-by-item t-tests assessed the impact of the training on each question. Fifteen out of 41 individual items (36.6%) showed a significant difference in response between the control and intervention group. A positive mean difference demonstrates that the intervention group responded in the desired way, based on the content of the training and in comparison to the control group. The magnitude of the difference varied depending on the question, and all but two questions showed a meaningful increase of half a mark or more.

Question ⁷	Intervention mean	Control mean	Mean difference	t statistic	Sig (2-tailed)
q4a I am familiar with the full range of intervention options available to me under the Public Protection Tactical Menu of Options (PPTMO)	3.99	2.72	1.27	4.44	0.00
q4b I frequently apply the National Decision Model to assess risk	5.82	4.68	1.14	4.04	0.00
q4c If someone is frustrated with you, it can help the situation to tell them you realise they are frustrated	4.69	4.6	0.09	0.40	0.69
q4d Negative early life experiences affect people's response to situations	5.24	4.85	0.39	1.51	0.13
q4e *I should NOT focus all my attention on a conversation even if I risk missing something going on around me	4.9	4.95	-0.05	-0.22	0.83

⁶ Questions highlighted in green demonstrated a significant difference in the expected direction between the control and intervention group scores, whilst non-highlighted questions were not significant.

⁷ Questions marked with an asterisk have been altered post survey for ease of interpretation. Words in capitals have been added for the purpose of interpreting the results; these were not included in the original questions.

Evaluation of National Roll-out of Police Vulnerability Training

q4f	*A frontline response officer should NOT only focus on the circumstances of the incident they are attending	5.9	5.56	0.34	1.39	0.17
q4g	*Asking open questions is NOT often too time-consuming and DOES NOT lead to irrelevant information	6.07	5.53	0.54	2.42	0.02
q4i	*If a victim of a crime won't help themselves there IS much I can do to help them	5.66	5.67	-0.01	-0.06	0.96
q5a	*How a person is treated is NOT more important than the end result	3.19	3.03	0.16	0.62	0.53
q5c	I feel empowered to spend as much time with a vulnerable person as I feel necessary	4.53	4.32	0.21	0.69	0.49
q5d	*I should NOT keep questioning limited to the current matter being dealt with	5.5	5.03	0.47	2.05	0.04
q5e	I utilise the full range of powers available to prevent harm being caused in the future	5.82	4.95	0.87	3.67	0.00
q5f	*It DOES help to tell a victim who's in distress that you recognise they are upset	5.26	5.47	-0.21	-0.96	0.34
q5g	*It IS helpful to offer a vulnerable person advice and guidance during a conversation	5.89	5.75	0.14	0.71	0.48
q5h	*It is the role of partner agencies, AND the police, to support vulnerable people to build confidence in their own abilities	5.2	4.83	0.37	1.43	0.16
q5i	*Some vulnerable people do NOT DO little to deserve the help of the police	6.09	5.85	0.24	1.14	0.26

q6a	Understanding the potential impact of trauma helps me to deal with situations more effectively	5.81	5.5	0.31	1.38	0.17
q6b	*Some victims of crime are more deserving of a good service than others	5.89	5.76	0.13	0.54	0.59
q6c	*A persons past DOES have much bearing on their current situation	5.58	5.74	-0.16	-0.70	0.48
q6d	*It is important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it	5.97	5.31	0.66	2.68	0.01
q6e	When thinking about risk I look beyond the immediate person to others who might be affected	5.75	5.57	0.18	0.85	0.40
q6f	*I SHOULD NOT make sure I am planning what to say next whilst a person is talking to me	4.2	4.48	-0.28	-1.08	0.28
q6g	I can build rapport with victims by saying I'm sorry to hear about what's occurred	4.67	4.45	0.22	0.89	0.37
q6h	*Some of the victims that I work with could NOT behave better if they really wanted to	4.04	4.2	-0.16	-0.61	0.54
q6i	I often use the THRIVE approach when dealing with vulnerable people	5.53	4.75	0.78	2.95	0.00
q7b	The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) model is helpful to increase my understanding of why people are vulnerable to harm	4.88	4.18	0.7	3.26	0.00

q7c	*It is difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free	5.22	5.07	0.15	0.58	0.57
q7d	I frequently use the RARA model when managing risk	4.31	3.88	0.43	1.69	0.09
q7e	*Understanding why people are difficult DOES help me do my job well	5.65	5.26	0.39	1.61	0.11
q7f	My job is made easier when I tell victims I can see what they are going through	3.82	3.48	0.34	1.43	0.16
q7g	During a traumatic event, the brain protects you against long-term effects	3.87	2.98	0.89	3.05	0.00
q7h	Due to the significance of traumatic situations you are able to recall detailed memories	3.29	3.44	-0.15	-0.51	0.61
q7i	*It is NOT important to lead the conversation to get the best quality information	4.76	5	-0.24	-0.93	0.36
I am familiar with....						
q8a	The impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)	2.57	1.86	0.71	4.53	0.00
q8b	The impact of trauma on victims	3.07	2.63	0.44	3.13	0.00
q8c	The 5F (friend, fight, flight, freeze, flop) responses to overwhelming threat or trauma	3.21	2.33	0.88	4.96	0.00
q8d	The impact of traumatic incidents on my own wellbeing	2.99	2.61	0.38	2.41	0.02
q8e	The reasons perpetrators are motivated to commit crimes	2.72	2.42	0.3	2.00	0.049

Non-parametric tests		Intervention mean	Control mean	Mean difference	U statistic	
q4h	*It's NOT a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people	6.32	6.32	0.0	2874.00	0.77
q5b	*People will NOT always behave the same way when responding to trauma	6.51	6.41	0.10	2597.00	0.41
q7a	We can all be at risk of becoming vulnerable	6.32	5.98	0.34	2209.50	0.03

I: Follow-up survey factor analysis

Table 7.6: Factor analysis – follow-up

Factor	Factor name	Reliability	Question Number	Question
1	Attitude to vulnerability	0.85	rq4h	*It's NOT a waste of time trying to help some vulnerable people.
			rq4i	*If a victim of a crime won't help themselves there IS much I can do to help them.
			rq5h	*It is the role of partner agencies, AND the police, to support vulnerable people to build confidence in their own abilities.
			rq5i	*Some vulnerable people do NOT DO little to deserve the help of the police.
			rq6b	*Some victims of crime are more deserving of a good service than others.
			rq6d	*It is important to make a judgement about whether a victim is going to see a complaint through before spending too much time on it.
			rq6h	*Some of the victims that I work with could NOT behave better if they really wanted to.
			rq7c	*It is difficult to treat all vulnerable people like they are completely blame free.
2	Familiarity with contributors to vulnerability	0.75	rq7e	*Understanding why people are difficult DOES help me do my job well.
			q4a	I am familiar with the full range of intervention options available to me under the Public Protection Tactical Menu of Options (PPTMO).
			q8a	I am familiar with the impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs).
			q8b	I am familiar with the impact of trauma on victims.

			q8d	I am familiar with the impact of traumatic incidents on my own wellbeing.
			q8e	I am familiar with the reasons perpetrators are motivated to commit crimes.
3	Model use	0.70	q7b	The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) model is helpful to increase my understanding of why people are vulnerable to harm.
			q7d	I frequently use the RARA model when managing risk.
4	Overall approach to vulnerability	0.74	q4b	I frequently apply the National Decision Model to assess risk.
			rq5b	*People will NOT always behave the same way when responding to trauma.
			q5c	I feel empowered to spend as much time with a vulnerable person as I feel necessary.
			q5e	I utilise the full range of powers available to prevent harm being caused in the future.
			q6i	I often use the THRIVE approach when dealing with vulnerable people.
			q8c	I am familiar with the 5F (friend, fight, flight, freeze, flop) responses to overwhelming threat or trauma.
5	Communication skills	0.67	rq4f	*A frontline response officer should NOT only focus on the circumstances of the incident they are attending.
			rq4g	*Asking open questions is NOT often too time-consuming and DOES NOT lead to irrelevant information.
			rq5d	*I should NOT keep questioning limited to the current matter being dealt with.
			rq5g	*It IS helpful to offer a vulnerable person advice and guidance during a conversation.

J: Follow-up survey factor results

Table 7.7: Follow-up survey factor t-test results⁸

Factor	Intervention mean	Control mean	Mean difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
1. Attitudes to vulnerability	5.39	5.55	0.16	0.35
2. Familiarity with contributors to vulnerability	2.43	3.16	0.73	0.000
3. Model use	4.04	4.60	0.55	0.007
4. Overall approach to vulnerability	4.60	5.24	0.64	0.000
5. Communication skills	5.45	5.85	0.39	0.023

⁸ Questions highlighted in green demonstrated a significant difference in the expected direction between the control and intervention group scores, whilst non-highlighted questions were not significant.

K: Follow-up survey items – non-significant questions

Table 7.8: Non-significant follow-up survey questions

	Question	Question topic	Intervention mean	Control mean	Mean difference	Significant Item	Included in a factor?
q4c	If someone is frustrated with you, it can help the situation to tell them you realise they are frustrated	Communication - rapport building	4.69	4.6	0.09	No	No
q4d	Negative early life experiences affect people's response to situations	Trauma	5.24	4.85	0.39	No	No
q4e	*I should NOT focus all my attention on a conversation even if I risk missing something going on around me	Communication - rapport building	4.9	4.95	-0.05	No	No
q5a	*How a person is treated is NOT more important than the end result	Trauma	3.19	3.03	0.16	No	No
q5f	*It DOES help to tell a victim who's in distress that you recognise they are upset	Communication - rapport building	5.26	5.47	-0.21	No	No
q6a	Understanding the potential impact of trauma helps me to deal with situations more effectively	Trauma	5.81	5.5	0.31	No	No

Evaluation of National Roll-out of Police Vulnerability Training

q6c	*A persons past DOES have much bearing on their current situation	Trauma	5.58	5.74	-0.16	No	No
q6e	When thinking about risk I look beyond the immediate person to others who might be affected	Professional curiosity	5.75	5.57	0.18	No	No
q6f	*I SHOULD NOT make sure I am planning what to say next whilst a person is talking to me	Communication - rapport building	4.2	4.48	-0.28	No	No
q6g	I can build rapport with victims by saying I'm sorry to hear about what's occurred	Communication - rapport building	4.67	4.45	0.22	No	No
q7f	My job is made easier when I tell victims I can see what they are going through	Communication - rapport building	3.82	3.48	0.34	No	No
q7h	Due to the significance of traumatic situations you are able to recall detailed memories	Trauma	3.29	3.44	-0.15	No	No
q7i	*It is NOT important to lead the conversation to get the best quality information	Communication - rapport building	4.76	5	-0.24	No	No