



Sandford, D. M., Kirtley, O. J., Lافit, G., Thwaites, R. and O'Connor, R. C. (2020) An investigation into the factor structure of the Attitudes to Suicide Prevention Scale. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 41(2), pp. 97-104.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/184007/>

Deposited on: 15 April 2019

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## An investigation into the factor structure of the

### Attitudes to Suicide Prevention scale

**Authors: David M. Sandford**<sup>1,2</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0003-2564-2643), **Olivia J. Kirtley**<sup>3</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0001-5879-4120), **Ginette Lafit**<sup>3</sup> (ORCID: [0000-0002-8227-128X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8227-128X)), **Richard Thwaites**<sup>1</sup> ORCID: (0000-0002-6104-7027), **Rory C. O'Connor**<sup>2</sup> (ORCID: 0000-0002-3650-4994)

<sup>1</sup>First Step, Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Cumbria, England, <sup>2</sup>Suicidal Behaviour Research Laboratory, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, <sup>3</sup>Center for Contextual Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

Corresponding Author:

David M. Sandford

24, Black Dyke Road, Arnside Cumbria, LA5 0HJ, UK.

Phone: 07717361681

Email: [davidsandford@cumbria.nhs.uk](mailto:davidsandford@cumbria.nhs.uk)

Authors' Disclosure:

All authors contributed to the writing of this submission. GL provided statistical consultation. We would like to acknowledge the work of the host trust for questionnaire distribution and for data collection.

DMS is completing a PhD funded by Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust.

OJK is supported by a fellowship from an FWO Odysseus grant (Myin-Germeys, FWO GOF8416N).

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To investigate the factor structure of the Attitudes to Suicide Prevention Scale (ASPS).

**Methods:** The ASPS was distributed to all staff in a UK National Health Service Trust (N=957). We conducted an exploratory factor analysis followed by a confirmatory factor analysis by splitting the data 60/40 into training and testing subsets. A multiple regression analysis was carried out to investigate whether the overall scale score varied as a function of professional role, age, gender and whether respondents had completed suicide prevention training or not.

**Results:** Two items displaying poor item-scale correlation were excluded from the factor analysis and a further item was excluded as it was based on different anchor points. For the remaining 11 items no adequate factor structure emerged. The scale total did demonstrate statistically significant differences in attitudes between staff groups (defined by attendance at suicide awareness or prevention training, gender and by level of patient contact), but not between groups defined by age range. Generally, however, there were positive attitudes across all Trust staff.

**Conclusions:** Our findings found no satisfactory factor structure for the ASPS. Further scale development would be beneficial.

**Keywords:** Staff attitudes, Suicide prevention, Clinician, ASP.

## INTRODUCTION

Approximately 800,000 people die by suicide each year (World Health Organisation, 2017). A third of those who are lost to suicide are individuals who had been in contact with mental health services in the 12 months prior to death (Luoma, Martin, & Pearson, 2002).

Every clinical encounter is an opportunity to potentially prevent a suicide and clearly, mental health services have a central role and responsibility in suicide prevention.

The opportunity to identify those at risk of suicide does of course extend beyond contact with mental health services. For example, an estimated 77% of those who die by suicide had attended their GP service in the 12 months prior to death (NCISH, 2016). Identification of risk can itself be problematic. A recent study highlighted the high rates of misclassification between suicidal behaviours and non-suicidal self-directed violence and the potential impact of this on risk assessment, management and interventions (Cwik & Teismann, 2017). They found that rates of misclassification were largely independent of length of professional experience among psychologists but they identified particular biases when classifying the behaviour of female patients and those with a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder (for example, suicidal behaviour of female patients was significantly more often interpreted as non-suicidal self directed violence (30.5%) compared to male patients (52.6%)).

The response of all health professionals to people at risk of suicide is of vital importance and it is likely to be influenced by their attitudes towards suicide and more specifically, towards suicide prevention. Furthermore, beliefs and attitudes can negatively impact upon the effectiveness of suicide risk assessment and management (Herron et al., 2001; Valente, 2011), for example, health professionals' beliefs about the preventability of suicide is likely to influence how risk is assessed and managed (Ramberg, Di Lucca, & Hadlaczky, 2016). Attitudes towards responsibility are also likely to affect engagement with

assessing risk, willingness to access training in risk management (Herron, Ticehurst, Appleby, Perry, & Cordingley, 2001), or influence risk assessment and management skills (Brunero, Smith, Bates, & Fairbrother, 2008).

Numerous studies have investigated the attitudes of health care staff towards suicide prevention (Brunero et al., 2008; Herron et al., 2001; Nebhinani, Gaikwad, & Tamphasana, 2013), often using the Attitudes to Suicide Prevention scale (ASPS) developed by Herron and colleagues (2001). In the original design of the scale, factor analysis was performed on 28 items which were reduced to 14 when items with poor factor loadings were dropped. Following validation of the scale by Herron et al. (2001), only one subsequent study has sought to replicate the original findings of the internal validity of the scale (Brunero et al., 2008), but to our knowledge, no studies have attempted to investigate the factor structure of the ASPS. Thus, despite its frequent use, the psychometric soundness of the ASPS has received little attention.

Herron et al. (2001) found that attitudes towards suicide prevention differed significantly between the four groups of health professionals they investigated: general practitioners, accident and emergency nurses, psychiatrists in training, and community psychiatric nurses. They concluded that more positive attitudes were associated with being a mental health professional, working in the community, and having had previous training in suicide risk assessment. Herron et al. (2001) suggested that some negative attitudes could result in the underestimation of risk and recommended that negative attitudes should be assessed and targeted in training designed to improve the management of suicide risk. More recently, Nebhinani et al. (2013) used the ASPS to study the attitudes of 308 nursing students. Whilst nearly half of their sample had positive attitudes toward working with

suicidal patients, half also considered suicide prevention efforts to be ineffectual. Nebhinani et al. (2013) concluded that this highlighted the need for further training in suicide prevention, recommending regular educational and training programmes on suicide assessment, risk reduction and prevention of suicide, supervision, and ongoing support for new staff and student nurses. Previous studies have investigated the impact of training on attitudes to suicide prevention although sample sizes have been small (Appleby et al., 2000; Brunero et al., 2008b; Ramberg et al., 2016) and therefore larger scale research in this area would be beneficial.

### **The current study**

This study emerged out of discussions within a UK NHS Trust about the need to prioritise suicide prevention, as has been identified within the NHS more widely (The Mental Health Taskforce, 2016). As part of this effort a survey of attitudes of Trust staff to suicide prevention was conducted. Whilst previous studies using the ASPS had focussed upon health professionals, in this study we investigated attitudes across the entirety of trust staff, consistent with local and national policy initiatives that highlight suicide prevention as everybody's business (Mathieson & Twiselton, 2014; Public Health England, 2016).

In sum, this study has the following three aims: (i) to investigate the internal consistency of the ASPS and its factor structure; (ii) to investigate whether differences in attitudes to suicide prevention existed between staff members with different vocational roles (as defined by their contact with patients) or as a function of age or gender; and (iii) to explore whether there was an association between attendance at training in suicide awareness or prevention, and attitudes to suicide prevention.

## **METHOD**

### **Participant recruitment and procedure**

The NHS Trust studied provides community and mental health services to a population of half a million people and employs around 4000 staff. The clinical services are divided into four Care Groups; Mental Health (Community Mental Health Teams, Crisis Teams and Primary Care Psychological Therapy), Community Services (e.g. District Nursing, Occupational Therapy, Physiotherapy, Cardiac Rehabilitation), Children and Families (e.g. Health Visiting, School Nursing, Child and Adolescent Mental Health), and Specialist Services (e.g. Learning Disability, Specialist Dentistry, Neurology, Diabetes) with a fifth group covering Corporate Services.

An anonymous online questionnaire was distributed in December 2016 to all Trust employees (n≈4000) via the Trust newsletter, which was delivered electronically to all employees. Links to the questionnaire were also distributed via emails through the communication channels of each Care Group within the Trust. As this was designed as service audit, NHS ethical approval was not required. As part of the introduction to the questionnaire participants were advised of the subject matter to be addressed, that they would not be identifiable, and they were asked to contact the Suicide Prevention Project Lead for the Trust if they had any questions or concerns.

### **Measures**

#### *Demographics*

All participants were asked to respond with; age, gender, suicide prevention or awareness training attended, Care Group, geographical work base, and level of patient contact offered by vocational role. Level of patient contact was defined by three categories: 'clinical staff with patient contact' (e.g. those employed in clinical roles); 'non-clinical staff

with some patient contact' (e.g. estates, facilities and administration); and those staff with 'no patient contact' (e.g. support services, governance, IT, non-executive directors).

### *Attitudes to suicide prevention*

The Attitudes to Suicide Prevention scale (ASPS) (Herron et al., 2001), is a fourteen item questionnaire (see Table 2) which asks people to rate their attitudes on a five point Likert scale from 1 to 5 anchored at Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Uncertain, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Two Items (items 4 and 14) are reverse scored and one item (Item 14) is anchored at None, Few, Many, Most, All. A lower score on the ASPS indicates more positive attitudes towards suicide prevention.

### **Statistical Analyses**

Originally, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in SPSS v22 using minimum residual extraction with an oblimin rotation, and applied the Kaiser-Guttman criteria (eigenvalues > 1) for retaining items. Following initial reviewer comments and further discussion within the research team, several issues arose. First, the original validation paper for the ASPS does not in fact report the factor structure nor item loadings resulting from their principal components analysis (PCA) of the scale. The first author (DS) contacted the corresponding author of the original Herron et al (2001) paper to make enquiries regarding the results of the original PCA of the ASPS, however details beyond those included in the paper were unfortunately no longer available (Appleby, personal communication). The use of a total score for the ASPS (Brunero et al., 2008; Herron et al., 2001) does appear to assume a single-factor solution, as had we, however there is no published record of such a structure having been validated. Furthermore, a single-factor structure may be somewhat surprising, given that the initial pool of items generated by Herron et al. (2001) prior to PCA,

could be grouped into six themes: the accuracy of suicide risk assessment in clinical practice; the interpretation of expressions of suicidal intent; the responsibility of a clinician in preventing suicide; the practicality of preventing suicide in clinical practice; the preventability of suicide in general; and the impact of nonclinical factors on suicide rates. Additionally, Herron et al.'s (2001) original validation of the ASPS was carried out using PCA which, whilst frequently used interchangeably with EFA, has different objectives and results in different outcomes from EFA (Costello & Osborne, 2005). In the absence of a validated factor structure to confirm, we decided to first use EFA to investigate the factor structure of the ASPS, then validate the factor structure that emerged from our EFA using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in a subset of the sample. Data were randomly divided into training and testing subset samples, comprising 60% and 40% of the dataset, respectively. EFA was conducted using the Psych package (Revelle, 2018) in R, with a minimum residual extraction method and oblimin rotation, to allow for correlation between factors. As data are ordinal and not continuous, we used polychoric correlations instead of Pearson's correlations to reduce the likelihood of overfitting, as recommended by Van der Eijk & Rose (2015) and Watkins, (2018). First, parallel analysis (PA) was conducted on the training sample in order to obtain a recommendation of the number of factors to retain. PA indicated that two factors should be retained and consequently, we conducted an EFA specifying two factors. Visual inspection of data using histograms of responses to individual items showed the data were not normally distributed, therefore the EFA was conducted upon the covariance matrix instead of the correlation matrix, as this is less affected by issues of dispersion and violations of multivariate normality (Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987; Yong & Pearce, 2013). Items with loadings below .3 were suppressed. Inspection of inter-item correlations demonstrated that items 7 ("It is easy for people not involved in clinical practice to make judgements

about suicide prevention”) and 9 (“People have the right to take their own lives”) did not correlate well with any of the other items in the scale, so they were removed. Item 14 (“What proportion of suicides do you consider preventable?”) was also removed prior to factor analysis, as this item is not on the same scale as the other items. The ratio of participants to items was approximately 50:1 for the EFA and 37:1 for the CFA (ratios of greater than 10:1 are considered acceptable, with greater than 30:1 desirable (Yong & Pearce, 2013)). RMarkdown of analysis code is available from the corresponding author. Internal consistency for the ASPS was calculated (Cronbach’s alpha and McDonald’s omega). A multiple linear regression was performed with the total score for the scale as the dependent variable and attendance at training, gender, work role and age range as the independent variables. The regression was conducted using SPSS 22 for Windows. The  $\alpha$  value for all tests was .05.

## RESULTS

### Participants

1012 staff members returned the questionnaire (Table 1), giving an approximate 25% response rate. 55 respondents failed to complete the ASPS and were excluded from the analysis. This left 957 respondents who completed the ASPS (Herron et al., 2001) yielding a final response rate of approximately 24%. Table 1 provides a breakdown of respondents by vocational role and by care group.

INSERT TABLE 1 NEAR HERE

Of the 1012 respondents, 797 identified as female, 154 as male, 5 preferred not to state their gender and 1 identified as transgender. The means and standard deviations for individual items of the ASPS are summarised in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 NEAR HERE

### **Factor Analysis**

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was 0.879, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant (2312,  $df = 55$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), both indicating that the 11 items were suitable for factor analysis.

### **Internal Consistency**

Cronbach's alpha for the fourteen item ASPS for this study was 0.76. This compares with 0.77 reported in the validation study by Herron et al. (2001) and 0.76 reported by Brunero et al. (2008). With items Q7, Q9 and Q14 removed, Cronbach's alpha for the remaining 11 items was 0.79. McDonald's omega was calculated as 0.79 for the original fourteen items and 0.81 with Q7, Q9 and Q14 removed.

### **EFA results**

#### *Parallel analysis*

Examination of the loadings matrix for a two-factor solution, as suggested by parallel analysis, indicated that items 4 ("Working with suicidal patients is rewarding") and 8 ("If a person survives a suicide attempt, then this was a ploy for attention") did not load. The BIC and RMSEA model fit indices suggested that the two-factor model was an acceptable fit,  $RMSEA = .064$  (90% CI: 0.051 - 0.077), values below .07 are classed as acceptable (Steiger, 2007),  $BIC = -104.6$ . The Tucker-Lewis index was .94. The Chi-square test was highly

significant and therefore did not indicate a good fit  $\chi^2(34) = 109.68$ ,  $p < .001$ , however when sample size is large, Chi-square tests can reject even correctly fitted factor models (Bentler & Bonett, 1980; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996).

### *One-factor model*

As previous work has assumed a single factor structure for the ASPS, we also fitted a one-factor model and compared this to the two-factor model suggested by parallel analysis, using an ANOVA. There was a statistically significant difference between the one- and two-factor models,  $p < .001$ , and examination of the BIC model fit statistics indicated that the one-factor model was a better fit (two-factor BIC: -104.60 vs one factor BIC: -114.16). The RMSEA for the one-factor model was not acceptable, RMSEA = .071 (90% CI: 0.059 - 0.082) and the Tucker-Lewis index was .92. The Chi-square test was significant, indicating poor fit:  $\chi^2(44) = 163.15$ ,  $p < .001$ . Given the six themes involved in initial item generation by Herron et al (2001), a one-factor model would be conceptually surprising, as qualitatively different items are then grouped together on a single factor.

### **CFA results**

What we can conclude from these analyses is that there is no factor structure that satisfies the requirements of both statistical and conceptual fit, for the current set of items. Neither model is a good statistical fit on any of the fit indices.

We have two “competing” models: the conceptual fit model (2 factors) and the statistical fit model (1 factor). We used the testing sample to estimate both of these models in a new, independent sample, using CFA, to see if support for either of the competing factor solutions could be found. CFA was conducted using the Lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) for

R. Diagonal Weighted Least Squares (DWLS) was used to estimate the factor structure, as this is less biased for ordinal data (Li, 2016).

#### *One-factor Model*

The RMSEA for the one-factor model was not acceptable, RMSEA = .075 (90% CI: 0.061 - 0.088) and the Tucker-Lewis index was .96. The Chi-square test was significant, indicating poor fit:  $\chi^2(44) = 144.65$ ,  $p < .001$ .

#### *Two-factor Model*

The RMSEA for the two-factor model was not acceptable, RMSEA = .080 (90% CI: 0.063 - 0.098) and the Tucker-Lewis index was .96. The Chi-square test was significant, indicating poor fit:  $\chi^2(26) = 94.08$ ,  $p < .001$ .

It should be noted however that the cut-off that we used of .07 for the acceptability of model fit is purposefully stringent (Steiger, 2007). (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996) have suggested a graded approach whereby <.05 indicates close fit, .05-.08 indicates fair fit, .08-.10 indicates mediocre fit and values above 0.10 indicate poor fit. By these criteria our CFA RMSEA values for both models could be considered to indicate a fair fit.

### **Multiple Linear Regression**

A multiple linear regression was run to predict total scale score (of the 11 item ASPS) from gender, attendance at training, age range, and role. Given the limited support for the unidimensionality of the scale these results need to be treated with caution.

There was linearity as assessed by partial regression plots and a plot of studentised residuals against the predicted values. There was homoscedasticity, as assessed by visual inspection

of a plot of studentised residuals versus unstandardized predicted values. There was no evidence of multicollinearity, as assessed by tolerance values greater than 0.1. There were two outliers with studentised deleted residuals greater than  $\pm 3$  standard deviations, however there were no leverage values greater than 0.2, and no values for Cook's distance above 1. As the results did not differ substantially with these outliers removed, they were included in the analysis. The assumption of normality of the residuals was met, as assessed by a Q-Q Plot.

The multiple regression model statistically significantly predicted scale total,  $F(9, 941) = 32.537, p < .0001, \text{adj. } R^2 = .230$ . However this would indicate a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). Prior attendance at suicide awareness or suicide risk training, gender and work role based on level of patient contact all added statistically significantly to the prediction ( $p < .05$ ). However age range only became significant from the age range 55-64 and above. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 NEAR HERE

## DISCUSSION

The use of the scale total, both in this study and in previous studies should be treated with caution given that we were unable to verify a factor structure for the ASPS. This study did support the findings of previous studies (Brunero et al., 2008; Herron et al., 2001), that the ASPS demonstrates good internal consistency. However, data from this study indicate that the internal reliability of the scale would be improved by removing two of the

fourteen questions; namely Q7 ('It is easy for people not involved in clinical practice to make judgments about suicide prevention') and Q9 ('People have the right to take their own lives'). This fits with informal feedback from participants in the survey that the meaning of Q7 is not clear and that a negative response to this question would not necessarily imply a negative attitude to suicide prevention. Question 9 may also be confounded given the debate surrounding voluntary euthanasia versus suicide prevention.

It noteworthy that a method of factor extraction that has been frequently used for the validation of Likert scale measures has been to use the Kaiser criteria (eigenvalues greater than one) supplemented by visual inspection of the screeplot of eigenvalues. Applying this approach to the dataset from the current study would indicate a one factor solution. This would be misleading and would not be supported by either a theoretical construct or by the more appropriate factor analysis procedure detailed herein. This should serve as a note of caution when selecting previously validated scales for research purposes and also supports the growing call for replication studies into scale validation.

Attitudes were found to be more positive among those who had attended suicide awareness or prevention training compared with those who had not attended training. It is important to note that this was a cross-sectional study and furthermore it is possible that those staff with a more positive attitude to suicide prevention would be more likely to seek out and attend training. Therefore these findings do not provide evidence that training promotes a positive change in attitude, however other studies (Appleby et al., 2000; Brunero et al., 2008; Ramberg et al., 2016) have specifically investigated this link and provide some limited evidence that this may be the case.

The findings from the present study suggest that attitudes to suicide prevention were more positive (i.e. scores on the ASP scale are lower) among staff groups with greater patient contact. It should be stressed however, that overall attitudes were positive, in that none of the three staff groupings reported mean total scores higher than the midpoint for the scale (which would indicate more negative attitudes).

Males in this sample were found to have significantly more positive attitudes than females. This was contrary to previous findings from Brunero et al. (2008) who reported no difference on total score of the ASPS based on gender.

Herron et al. (2001) and Brunero et al. (2008) found no significant association between ASPS total and age. Nebhinani et al. (2013) also found no significant difference in attitudes between different age ranges although they did note that in the population they studied, the overall age range was quite narrow. The current study found that the mean total scale scores for the 5 age ranges increased through the age bandings, suggesting a more negative attitude with increasing age. However age range only became significantly predictive of total ASPS score with a negative correlation from the 45 – 54 age range onwards. Age bandings were used in this study as another means of ensuring confidentiality, however if actual age in years had been collected the results may have been more illustrative.

As Herron et al. (2001) made clear when developing the ASPS, attitudes deemed more negative (and therefore with higher scores on the scale) are not implied to be incorrect. However, they hypothesised that responses deemed more negative to suicide prevention may be indicators of behaviours which are less effective in managing those at risk of suicide. They gave examples from their findings of a group which was most likely to

believe that people who are serious about dying by suicide will not tell anyone; and a group who reported most agreement that nonfatal self-harm is a 'ploy for attention', and made the suggestion that such attitudes could result in the underestimation of risk in people with suicidal ideas or recent self-harm. However future research may also wish to investigate the extent to which all of the items (e.g., "I don't feel comfortable assessing someone for suicide risk") are actually measuring attitudes towards suicide prevention.

### **Limitations**

Although our sample size was large, it is important to note that the response rate was low (24%), therefore, it is possible that people with more negative attitudes did not complete the survey. Furthermore, the response rate itself is only an estimate as, due to the method of recruitment, it is not known exactly how many people from the total staff employed by the Trust received the invitation to complete the survey. Unfortunately we do not have data on the non-responders so were not able to explore how representative our sample was of the total workforce. Our sample differed from that of the original scale development study. Our sample includes all NHS Trust staff rather than just health professionals so it is possible that this has introduced measurement variance, i.e. the scale may not be reflecting the same construct across the different samples (Hussey and Hughes, 2018). The majority of responders (79%) were female and this may need to be taken into account before generalising the results. The cross-sectional nature of this study limits the conclusions that can be drawn, so no inferences can be made about how the attitudes reported in the survey affect the interactions between staff and those at risk of suicide. The scope of this study limited the investigation of the validity of the scale. For instance convergent and test – retest validity were not examined.

## Conclusion

This study did not yield a satisfactory factor structure for the ASPS and as the unidimensionality of the scale has not been confirmed, use of the scale total should be treated with caution. Further attention to scale development would be beneficial, to ensure statistical and conceptual fit in the factor structure. Researchers and evaluators might wish to consider using alternative existing scales to assess attitudes towards suicide prevention; including scales which focus on attitudes and knowledge more broadly (e.g. Kodaka, Postuvan, Inagaki, & Yamada, 2011, Batterham, Calear, & Christensen, 2013, Scocco, Castriotta, Toffol, & Preti, 2012, Kishi, Kurosawa, Morimura, Hatta, & Thurber, 2011). It could be hypothesised that there are benefits to an organisation in the act itself of carrying out a survey of this type. Enquiring about attitudes to suicide prevention could help individuals reflect on their own beliefs in a beneficial way and help strengthen the message that it is important that all staff is aware of suicide risk and that suicide prevention is indeed everyone's business.

Table 1				
Number of respondents by care group and vocational role				
	Vocational Role			
Care Group	Number of Clinical Staff (%)	Number of Non- Clinical Staff but with some Patient Contact (%)	Number of Staff with no Patient Contact (%)	Total number of Staff (%)
Specialist Services	82 (9)	15 (2)	10 (1)	107 (11)
Mental Health	292 (31)	38 (4)	15 (2)	345 (36)
Community Health	209 (29)	21 (2)	8 (1)	238 (25)
Corporate Services	5 (1)	19 (2)	130	154 (16)
Children and Families	88 (9)	15 (2)	10 (1)	113 (12)
Totals (%)	676 (71)	108 (11)	173 (18)	957 (100)

Table 2		
Mean scores per item		
Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1. I resent being asked to do more about suicide	1.69	0.798
Q2. Suicide prevention is not my responsibility	1.66	0.823
Q3. Making more funds available to the appropriate health services would make no difference to the suicide rate	2.11	1.010
Q4. Working with suicidal patients is rewarding (R)	2.63	0.750
Q5. If people are serious about ending their life by suicide they don't tell anyone	2.65	1.011
Q6. I feel defensive when people offer advice about suicide prevention	1.88	0.758
Q7. It is easy for people not involved in clinical practice to make judgments about suicide prevention	3.26	0.948
Q8. If a person survives a suicide attempt, then this was a ploy for attention	1.76	0.796
Q9. People have the right to take their own lives	3.23	0.862

Q10. Since unemployment and poverty are the main causes of suicide, there is little that an individual can do to prevent it	1.80	0.663
Q11. I don't feel comfortable assessing someone for suicide risk	2.95	1.289
Q12. Suicide prevention measures are a drain on resources, which would be more useful elsewhere	1.66	0.697
Q13. There is no way of knowing who is going to end their life by suicide	2.82	1.012
Q14. What proportion of suicides do you consider preventable? (R)	2.86	0.779
Total	32.96	0.198

Table 3: Summary of multiple regression analysis

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE<sub>B</sub></i>	<i>β</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	24.804	.972	-	<.0005
Gender (Female ,Male)	-1.087	.438	-.072	.013
Training attendance (No, Yes)	-4.883	.353	-.419	<.0005
Age Range : 18-24 v 25-34	.455	.895	.030	.611 (ns)
Age Range: 18-24 v 35-44	1.330	.870	.102	.127 (ns)
Age Range: 18-24 v 45-54	1.357	.852	.116	.112(ns)
Age Range: 18-24 v 55-64	2.219	.885	.156	.012
Age Range: 18-24 v 65-75	3.207	1.535	.069	.037
Work Role: Clinical v No contact	1.283	.518	.073	.013
Work Role: Clinical v Non Clinical, some contact	1.515	.442	.105	.001

*B* = unstandardised regression coefficient, *SE<sub>B</sub>* = Standard error of the coefficient, *β* = standardised coefficient, *ns* = not significant at  $p > .05$

## REFERENCES

- Appleby, L., Morriss, R., Gask, L., Roland, M., Perry, B., Lewis, A., Faragher, B. (2000). An educational intervention for front-line health professionals in the assessment and management of suicidal patients (The STORM Project). *Psychological Medicine*, 30(4), 805–812. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291799002494>
- Batterham, P.,J., Calear, A.,L., & Christensen, H. (2013) Correlates of Suicide Stigma and Suicide Literacy in the Community. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 43(4), 406-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12026>
- Bentler, P., & Bonett, D. (1980) Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588-606. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588>
- Brunero, S., Smith, J., Bates, E., & Fairbrother, G. (2008). Health professionals' attitudes towards suicide prevention initiatives. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*, 15(7), 588–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2008.01278.x>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Costello, A.,& Osbourne, J. (2005). Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most From Your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- Cwik, J. C., & Teismann, T. (2017). Misclassification of Self-Directed Violence: Self-Directed Violence. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 24(3), 677–686. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2036>

- Herron, J., Ticehurst, H., Appleby, L., Perry, A., & Cordingley, L. (2001). Attitudes Toward Suicide Prevention in Front-Line Health Staff. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 31(3), 342–347. <https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.31.3.342.24252>
- Hussey, I., & Hughes, S. (2018, November 19). Hidden invalidity among fifteen commonly used measures in social and personality psychology. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/7rbfp>
- Jöreskog, K. & Sörbom, D. (1996) LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Kishi, Y., Kurosawa, H., Morimura, H., Hatta, K., & Thurber, S. (2011) Attitudes of Japanese nursing personnel toward patients who have attempted suicide. *General Hospital Psychiatry* 33(4) 393-397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2011.02.005>
- Kodaka, M., Postuvan, V., Inagaki, M., Yamada, M. (2011) A Systematic Review of Scales That Measure Attitudes Toward Suicide. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 57(4) 338-361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764009357399>
- Li, C-H. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(3), 936-949. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0619-7>
- Luoma, J. B., Martin, C. E., & Pearson, J. L. (2002). Contact With Mental Health and Primary Care Providers Before Suicide: A Review of the Evidence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 159(6), 909–916. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.159.6.909>
- MacCallum, R.C. Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M., (1996). Power Analysis and Determination of Sample Size for Covariance Structure Modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130-149.

- Mathieson, & Twiselton. (2014). A Refreshed Suicide Prevention Strategy for Cumbria 2014-2017. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://councilportal.cumbria.gov.uk/documents/s30275/A%20Refreshed%20Suicide%20Prevention%20Strategy%20for%20Cumbria%202014-2017.pdf>
- NCISH, The National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Homicide by People with Mental Illness. Making Mental Health Care Safer: Annual Report and 20-year Review. (2016). The National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Homicide by People with Mental Illness. *University of Manchester*. Retrieved from <http://16878-presscdn-0-18.pagely.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/2016-report.pdf>
- Nebhinani, N., Mamta, Gaikwad, A., & Tamphasana, L. (2013). *Nursing students' attitude toward suicide prevention* (Vol. 22). <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-6748.132922>
- Osborne, J. W., & Costello, A. B. (2009). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Pan-Pacific Management Review, 12*(2), 131–146.
- Public Health England. (2016). Local suicide prevention planning National Suicide Prevention Alliance Supported by A practice resource. *Public Health England in Partnership with the National Suicide Prevention Alliance*. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/564420/phe\\_local\\_suicide\\_prevention\\_planning\\_a\\_practice\\_resource.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/564420/phe_local_suicide_prevention_planning_a_practice_resource.pdf)
- Ramberg, I.-L., Di Lucca, M., & Hadlaczky, G. (2016). The Impact of Knowledge of Suicide Prevention and Work Experience among Clinical Staff on Attitudes towards Working with Suicidal Patients and Suicide Prevention. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(2), 195. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13020195>

- Revelle, W. (2018) psych: Procedures for Personality and Psychological Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, USA, <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych> Version = 1.8.12.
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(1), 1-36, [https://doi.org/ 10.18637/jss.v048.i02](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02)
- Scocco, P., Castriotta, C., Toffol, E., & Preti, A., (2012). Stigma of Suicide Attempt (STOSA) scale and Stigma of Suicide and Suicide Survivor (STOSASS) scale: Two new assessment tools. *Psychiatry Research*, 200(2), 872-878. [https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.psychres.2012.06.033](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2012.06.033)
- Steiger, J. (2007). Understanding the limitations of global fit assessment in structural equation modelling. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(5), 893-898. [https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.017)
- The Mental Health Taskforce. (2016). The Five Year Forward View For Mental Health. Retrieved January 15, 2017, from <https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Mental-Health-Taskforce-FYFV-final.pdf>
- Tinsley, H., & Tinsley, D. (1987) Uses of factor analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34(4), 414-424. [http://doi.org/ 10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.414](http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.4.414)
- Valente, S. (2011). Nurses' psychosocial barriers to suicide risk management. *Nursing Research and Practice*, 2011, 650765. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/650765>
- Van der Eijk, C. & Rose, J. (2015) Risky Business: Factor Analysis of Survey Data – Assessing the Probability of Incorrect Dimensionalisation. *PloS One*, 10(3), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118900>

Watkins, M. W. (2018). Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *Journal of Black Psychology, 44*(3), 219–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418771807>

World Health Organisation (2018). National suicide prevention strategies: progress, examples and indicators. Geneva: World Health Organisation.

Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 9*(2), 79–94.