

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	The Adaptation of a Measure of Confidence in Assessing, Formulating, and Managing Suicide Risk
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/45647/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000830
Date	2021
Citation	Sandford, David, Kirtley, Olivia J., Thwaites, Richard, Dagnan, Dave and O'Connor, Rory C. (2021) The Adaptation of a Measure of Confidence in Assessing, Formulating, and Managing Suicide Risk. <i>Crisis</i> , 44 (1). pp. 70-77. ISSN 0227-5910
Creators	Sandford, David, Kirtley, Olivia J., Thwaites, Richard, Dagnan, Dave and O'Connor, Rory C.

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000830>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

The Adaptation of a Measure of Confidence in Assessing, Formulating, and Managing Suicide Risk

Authors: David M. Sandford^{1,2} (ORCID: 0000-0003-2564-2643), **Olivia J. Kirtley³** (ORCID: 0000-0001-5879-4120), **Richard Thwaites⁴** (ORCID: 0000-0002-6104-7027), **Dave Dagnan⁴** (ORCID: 0000-0002-5709-1586), **Rory C. O'Connor²** (ORCID: 0000-0002-3650-4994)

¹University of Central Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire, England, ²Suicidal Behaviour Research Laboratory, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, ³Center for Contextual Psychiatry, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, ⁴Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Cumbria, England.

Corresponding Author: David M. Sandford,

Suicidal Behaviour Research Lab, Mental Health & Wellbeing Academic Centre, Gartnavel Royal Hospital, 1055 Great Western Road, Glasgow, G12 0XH UK. Email: d.sandford.1@research.gla.ac.uk

Authors' Disclosure:

Declaration of Interest: None

DMS, Writing – First draft, Investigation, Data Curation; OJK, Software, Writing – review and editing, Supervision; RT, Conceptualisation, Methodology, Writing – review; DD, Conceptualisation, Methodology, Writing – review; ROC, Writing - review and editing, Supervision.

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

OJK is supported by a Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship from Research Foundation Flanders (FWO 1257821N)

Ethics approval for this human study was waived by Research and Development Department, Cumbria Partnership NHS Foundation Trust. Adult participant consent was not required because this was a clinical audit of NHS staff and consent was implied by the completion of the measure.

ABSTRACT

Background To date little has been done to evaluate the effectiveness of suicide risk formulation training.

Aims To investigate the psychometric properties of a new scale measuring clinicians' confidence in assessing, formulating and managing suicide risk.

Method A total of 128 mental health practitioners from an NHS Trust completed the scale. 85 from an Improving Access to Psychological Therapies service did so prior to, and after training in Risk Assessment, Formulation and Management (RAFM). 28 practitioners from the Older Adults service also completed the measure. For test–retest analysis, a further 15 completed the scale again one week after baseline without attending any training. 52 of the training group (61%) completed the measure at six-month follow-up.

Results Analysis indicated a single-factor structure, good test–retest reliability and statistically significant increases in confidence between pre- and post-training and between pre-training and six-month follow-up. Cohen's effect size values suggest a moderate to large effect.

Limitations

The relatively small sample sizes indicate that this study should be considered a preliminary investigation of a new measure, which warrants further replication.

Conclusions

This measure could be useful in gauging practitioners' confidence in the RAFM approach and in evaluating and developing training.

INTRODUCTION.

Every year, worldwide, approximately 800,000 people die by suicide (World Health Organization, 2019), with around 20 times this number making suicide attempts (World Health Organization, 2014). A broad range of suicide prevention strategies have been implemented, from the wider public health initiatives such as restricting access to means to the more focussed efforts of risk assessment within higher risk groups. The present study was conducted in the context of suicide prevention for people with common mental health problems within a primary care psychological therapy service.

A range of risk assessment tools is employed in mental health services however such tools are poor at predicting who will engage in self-harm or suicidal behaviour (Quinlivan et al., 2017, Steeg et al., 2018). Indeed, best practice guidance has, for over a decade, cautioned that decisions on risk management should not be based solely on the use of assessment tools but on the broader application of structured clinical judgement and risk formulation (Department of Health, 2007). As a result, the emphasis has shifted from prediction to prevention; providing a narrative account of what is known about the individual to develop a safety plan that promotes positive risk management. With risk formulation the presence and relevance of risk factors (the predisposing factors) are considered alongside details of an individual's current situation (the perpetuating factors) and any potential imminent experiences (the precipitating factors) and these are balanced against known strengths and resources (the protective factors). This narrative approach is an effective way to communicate risk and it should result in the development of a proportionate and jointly prepared safety plan (Lewis and Doyle, 2009).

Whilst best practice guidance on managing risk recommends training in, and application of, structured clinical judgement and risk formulation (Department of Health, 2007), little has been published on attempts to evaluate the impact of training into this approach (Doyle et al., 2003). One established method of evaluating risk training is to use the RAMSES scale designed to assess practitioners' levels of perceived confidence in risk assessment and management. The RAMSES is a widely used scale and has been shown to have high internal consistency, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.96$ ($n = 110$), and to display good construct validity (Delgadillo et al., 2014). Its psychometric properties have also been supported in further studies (Chongtham et al., 2015; Maina et al., 2019). However this scale does not include questions specifically related to risk formulation. Therefore, within the current study, we report on the adaptation of this scale originally developed by Delgadillo and colleagues and on its expansion to incorporate questions specific to the risk formulation approach. Such a scale would aid in gauging the effectiveness of risk formulation training and potentially guide the design of future training by identifying areas requiring improvement or further emphasis.

In short, this study aimed to investigate the utility of this new measure by exploring the following questions:

- 1) What is the underlying factor structure of the measure?
- 2) What are the internal consistency and test-retest properties of the measure?
- 3) Is this measure sensitive to change in confidence following the delivery of training?

METHOD

Participants.

In total, 128 practitioners from within a UK NHS Trust took part in this study. Recruitment took place between October 2014 and October 2016. 85 practitioners from the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) service within the Trust completed the measure prior to (pre-training), and after (post-training) attending training on risk assessment, management and formulation and in the use of the Galatean Risk and Safety Technology (GRiST - Vail et al., 2012) risk assessment tool (). This risk assessment tool is recommended in best practice guidelines (Department of Health, 2007) and supports clinicians in gathering the necessary information to assess risk in six areas (suicide, self harm, harm to others, self-neglect and vulnerability) and then supports the formulation and communication of any identified risk. The tool was designed through expert consensus (Buckingham et al., 2008; Vail et al., 2012), and refined through feedback from use in practice (Zaher & Buckingham, 2017). The English Improving Access to Psychological therapies (IAPT) (Clark, 2011) services are part of an initiative to increase access to mental health care.

For test–retest analysis, a further 15 IAPT practitioners completed the measure and then repeated it following a one week interval without undergoing any further training in the interim period. A convenience sample of a further 28 mental health practitioners from the Older Adults service also completed the measure to give a total of 128 completed measures for the factor analysis (see appendix 1 in the supplementary materials). 52 of the IAPT training group (61%) also completed the measure at six-month follow up (follow-up group).

Measures

Demographics. All practitioners were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire recording; gender, age, current role, years of experience in mental healthcare, experience of working with people at risk of suicide.

Therapist confidence in suicide risk assessment formulation and management. The confidence in suicide risk assessment, formulation and safety planning scale was developed from an existing measure of practitioners' confidence in assessment and management of risk, the Risk Assessment and Management Self-Efficacy Scale, RAMSES (Delgadillo et al., 2014) with the authors' permission. The original scale has 18 items (rated 0-10) comprised of three subscales of Assessment (six items), Case Management (six items) and Intervention (six items). The scale was revised to focus on suicide risk and to ensure that it captured all of the core elements of risk formulation and subsequent actions, including four items adapted from the RAMSES Assessment subscale and two items adapted from the Interventions scale. One item from the Case Management sub-scale was used with the original wording. The other six items on assessment and formulation were developed specifically for this scale based on the risk formulation approach (Lewis & Doyle, 2009). Selection of items and wording for new items were discussed and agreed by the first, third and fourth authors over the course of two consensus meetings.

The new scale was therefore comprised of thirteen items covering risk assessment, formulation and safety planning (see Table 1). There was no intention to create subscales within this measure. It was intended to capture confidence in the overall skills required for the assessment, formulation and management of the risk of suicide. It includes new questions on identifying predisposing, precipitating, perpetuating and protective factors, in combining risk factors into a suicide risk formulation and communicating a risk management plan. These were combined with the original questions on developing a risk management plan ("How confident are you that you can use the information from your formulation to develop an individual risk management plan?"), developing rapport and

referring on to an appropriate service if level of risk indicates this. The measure asks people to rate their confidence on a five point Likert-type scale (reduced from the ten-point scale used on RAMSES for ease of use and evidence that scales beyond 6 points confer no psychometric advantage (Simms et al., 2019)) anchored at 'not confident', slightly confident', moderately confident', 'confident' and 'highly confident'.

Therapist general confidence in clinical self-efficacy. The General Clinical Efficacy Scale (GCES) (Dagnan et al., 2015) is a measure of general clinical efficacy. The GCES was adapted (Dagnan et al., 2015) from the General Self-efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) and comprises 5 questions on perceived efficacy such as 'I can always manage to solve difficult clinical problems if I try hard enough'. Items are rated on a five point Likert-type scale anchored at 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'don't know', 'disagree', 'strongly disagree'. The measure was reported to have a Cronbach's alpha of 0.69 and an adjusted item-total correlation range of 0.31-0.51 (Dagnan et al., 2015). In this study the scale was used to provide a measure of general clinical efficacy against which to compare the new scale developed to specifically measure confidence in suicide risk assessment, formulation and management.

Statistical Analyses

Internal consistency of the new scale and of the GCES was examined using McDonald's omega.

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on the new scale responses (n = 128). EFA was conducted using the Psych package (Revelle, 2018) in R (*R: The R Project for Statistical Computing*, 2019) with a maximum likelihood extraction method and oblimin rotation, to

allow for correlation between factors. The sample size yielded a measure to item ratio of 9.8:1. As data are ordinal and not continuous, we used polychoric correlations instead of Pearson's correlations to reduce the likelihood of overfitting (Holgado-Tello et al., 2010; Watkins, 2018). We first conducted parallel analysis (PA) in order to obtain a recommendation of the number of factors to retain. PA indicated that one factor should be retained and consequently we conducted an EFA specifying a single factor. Visual inspection of data using histograms of responses to individual items showed the data were relatively normally distributed, therefore the EFA was conducted upon the correlation matrix (Watkins, 2018). Items with loadings below .3 were suppressed (Osborne & Costello, 2009). Inspection of inter-item correlations demonstrated that item 1 ("How confident are you that you can use GRiST to assess risk of suicide?") did not correlate well with any of the other items in the scale, so it was removed prior to factor analysis.

R markdown code is available on the Open Science Framework (OSF) project page for the study (https://osf.io/9erbt/?view_only=a56845fb45f44403969da038e3561fc0). Sharing de-identified data is not possible due to the nature of informed consent obtained in the original study, however following Kirtley, Hussey and Marzano (Kirtley et al., 2020) and Quintana (2020) we have created a synthetic dataset using the synthpop package (Nowok et al., 2020) and made this available for the purposes of analytic reproducibility. Synthetic datasets mimic the original dataset's distributions and covariance matrix. They can be used to verify that the code for the original analysis runs correctly, and will produce similar (but not identical) results. The synthetic dataset was screened for "replicated uniques", i.e. values from the real dataset that were replicated in the synthetic dataset by chance and any

such values were removed (Nowok et al., 2019). The questionnaire used in the study is also available on the OSF.

Differences between mean scores at baseline were examined either by independent samples t – test (gender) or by one way analysis of variance (age, role, experience) with post hoc Bonferroni corrections applied.

Differences between mean scores before and after training and at 6 month follow up were examined by repeated measures one-way analysis of variance. The data were normally distributed, as assessed by Normal Q-Q Plot. Mauchly's test of sphericity was employed, and the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied if the assumption of sphericity was violated. These analyses were conducted using Jamovi 1.6 (*The Jamovi Project*, 2020). The α value for all tests was .05.

RESULTS

Factor Analysis

Initial calculations of correlations suggested the exclusion of item 1 from the scale. The item-total correlation for item 1 was 0.48 compared with a range of 0.69 to 0.84 for the remaining 12 items. Inter-item correlations for items 2 to 13 were all above 0.4 (range 0.44 to 0.82), however correlations between item 1 and items 2 to 13 were between 0.12 and 0.38. Item 1 was therefore excluded from the questionnaire and a factor analysis was performed on items 2 – 13 (n=128). Bartlett's test of Sphericity (Chi-square = 1174, df = 66, $p < 0.001$) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.92) for the measures (n=128) both indicated that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The item

questions, means, standard deviations and the correlation for each item with the scale total for the scales completed by 128 practitioners are shown in Table 1. The breakdown of the 128 practitioners by occupational group with descriptives is provided for reference in Appendix 1.

The parallel analysis indicated a one-factor structure. The single factor accounted for 59% of the variance in the measure and all unrotated factor loadings were greater than 0.6. Factor loadings for the scale are presented in Table 1. As only one factor was extracted no factor rotation could be performed.

Insert Table 1 near here

Reliability

McDonald's omega for the 12 item scale was 0.95 indicating a high level of internal consistency for this scale. For the GCSE scale McDonald's omega was 0.90, again indicating high internal consistency.

Comparison between scores on the new scale and the General Clinical Self-Efficacy scale for 85 practitioners completed at pre-training indicated that the scores were positively correlated ($r = .40, p < 0.001$).

Test–retest

Correlation between the test and re-test total score was estimated using Pearson's correlation co-efficient ($r(13) = .95, p < 0.001$) which indicates good test–retest reliability.

Comparisons of confidence scores at baseline (pre-training).

At baseline for the training group (see Appendix 2) there was no statistically significant difference in the mean confidence scores reported between females (28.70; SD: ± 7.73) and males (31.37; SD: ± 6.09), $t(83) = 1.386$, $p = 0.170$. Although visual inspection suggests that the mean confidence score increased with age there were no statistically significant differences between the age ranges ($F(3) = 2.303$, $p = 0.083$). Analyses for years of experience working in mental health yielded a statistically significant difference $F(3) = 12.901$, $p < 0.01$ between year ranges, although post hoc testing showed that the significant difference was between the group with most experience (> 16 years) and each of the other groups, whilst all other comparisons were not significant. Similarly, analyses for experience of working with people at some risk of suicide suggested a statistically significant difference between groups, $F(3) = 10.15$, $p < 0.001$. However, post hoc Bonferroni tests showed that the significant differences were between the group with most exposure and the other three groups, whilst all other comparisons were not significant.

Change in confidence ratings following training.

52 participants completed questionnaires at pre-training, post-training and at 6 month follow-up. The mean confidence measure scores for these are shown in Appendix 3.

A repeated measures analysis of variance determined that mean confidence scores differed statistically significantly across the three time points (pre-training, post-training, 6 month follow up) ($F(1.763, 13.985) = 28.490$, $p < 0.001$). Post hoc Bonferroni analyses revealed a statistically significant increase in confidence between pre- and post- training ($t = 7.12$, $p < 0.001$) and between pre-training and 6 month follow up ($t = 5.73$, $p < 0.001$). Cohen's effect

size values ($d = 0.718$, $d = 0.577$) suggested a moderate to high significance in both cases. No significant change was evident between post-training and 6 month follow up ($d = 0.168$, $t = 1.40$, $p = 0.359$).

Next, change over time in broader confidence levels as measured by the General Clinical Efficacy Scale was examined. A repeated measures analysis of variance determined that mean confidence scores did not differ statistically significantly between the three time points (pre-training, post-training, 6 month follow up) ($F(1.273, 47.089) = 1.805$, $p = ns$).

DISCUSSION

This paper reports on the adaptation of an existing scale to develop a measure of practitioners' confidence in the assessment, formulation and management of suicide risk. The main aims were to investigate the factor structure, internal and test-retest consistency of the measure, and to explore if it appeared sensitive to change following training. Factor analysis supports the one factor structure of this new measure. In terms of psychometric properties, it displays good internal consistency and good test–retest reliability. The new measure appears sensitive to change in confidence following the delivery of training.

Currently around a third of people who die by suicide have been in contact with specialist mental health services in the year before their death, and two-thirds have seen their GP (Department of Health, 2017). The risk assessment tools used in these settings are poor at predicting self harm or suicidal behaviour and decisions on risk management should be based on structured clinical judgment and risk formulation. With this approach a narrative account of the relevance of risk factors to the individual is used to develop a safety plan.

However, ten years on from the publication of the best practice guidance, a report into the assessment of clinical risk in mental health services found evidence of inconsistent use of risk assessment tools, of them still being used as checklists to predict future behaviour and guide risk management, and of other problems such as lack of training (NCISH, National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health, 2018). The report concluded with recommendations to improve risk assessment; these included ensuring staff were comfortable asking about suicidal ideation and that they received training in the assessment, formulation and management of risk. To this end, an initiative within a northern English NHS Mental Health Trust involved the use of a train-the-trainer approach to support individual services to deliver training on risk assessment, formulation and management (RAFM). With risk formulation the presence and relevance of risk factors (the predisposing factors) are considered alongside details of the individual's current situation (the perpetuating factors) and any potential imminent experiences (the precipitating factors) and these are balanced against known strengths and resources (the protective factors). A narrative account of these factors effectively communicates risk and supports the development of a jointly agreed safety plan.

The new measure developed for this study was designed to monitor the training on the RAFM approach. It includes questions related to the assessment, formulation and management of suicide risk; including specific items on risk formulation (Predisposing, Perpetuating, Precipitating and Protective factors). Further questions assess confidence in establishing rapport and identifying appropriate services. Despite the breadth of questions the measure appears to coalesce around a one factor structure, representing the construct of confidence in applying the risk formulation approach.

The measure displayed some ability to discriminate between groups based on mental health experience and experience of working with people who were suicidal. This makes intuitive sense, as it might be expected that confidence would increase with experience. The new measure was able to detect increases in confidence following training and that this was maintained at 6 month follow up. The General Clinical Efficacy Scale for the same time points did not indicate any significant changes and this may support the hypothesis that increase in confidence in risk assessment, formulation and management was related to the training rather than a more global increase in clinical efficacy over time.

Conceptually it made sense to exclude item 1 for two reasons. First, this item had been added to the questionnaire to specifically ask about confidence in using a particular risk assessment tool, namely the GRiST (Vail et al., 2012). As this was the first time most people in the training group had been introduced to this tool it was likely that the impact of the training would be more pronounced as measured by item one as compared to the remaining items. This may therefore have exaggerated the sensitivity of the questionnaire in measuring change in confidence in the more generic risk assessment, formulation and management skills that it was being developed to assess. Second, the aim was to develop a measure that could be used generally to track changes in confidence and not to be specific to one particular assessment tool.

It may be of interest to note that the highest rated item at baseline was confidence in identifying protective factors, despite that fact that it is acknowledged that we know the least about this risk factor (Nock et al., 2013). It would be important to explore why this is the case. Could this be related to professional practice beliefs or attitudes of the

practitioners? It may be reassuring and indeed desirable to be able to highlight protective factors, but could confidence in the ability to do so be misplaced?

Clinical Implications

To our knowledge this is the first scale to specifically measure confidence in the RAFM approach and the only scale developed specifically to study the impact of training on using this approach. Clinicians have highlighted the need for, and importance of, training in risk formulation, and the benefit of improving staff confidence in the use of risk tools, recording of information and managing identified risk (Graney et al., 2020). Improving practitioners' confidence in their ability to implement a risk formulation approach to suicide may help them to more effectively engage in suicide prevention. Ultimately, if training can improve practitioners' confidence in RAFM, this has the potential to improve their therapeutic effectiveness (Vail et al., 2012). This would help services meet one of the recommendations of the NCISH report, to ensure practitioners are comfortable in asking about suicidal ideation. Additionally, it is important to guard against the inconsistent use of risk assessment tools or their use as checklists aimed at predicting future behaviour and guiding risk management. We feel that using this newly developed measure could contribute to these goals by focussing on the RAFM approach. Further it may assist in the refinement and appraisal of training in order to best meet the identified problems with lack of training (Graney et al., 2020; NCISH, National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health, 2018).

Limitations

Although this study reports on the development of a measure of confidence, it should be noted that this does not measure knowledge, or quality, of risk assessment, formulation and management. Ideally a measure of these skills would also be utilised to get a more complete indication of performance in this important area of practice. Due to a methodological oversight the demographic data was not collected for the mental health practitioners from the Older Adult service whose responses were included in the factor analysis.

The sample size for the number of completed measures was relatively low, yielding a measure to item ratio of just 9.8:1, rising slightly to 10:1 following the omission of one item. Although there is no clear consensus on the acceptable ratio of participants to items for factor analysis, this could be considered to be the minimum requirement, with ratios of greater than 10:1 considered acceptable and greater than 30:1 as desirable ((Yong & Pearce, 2013). The sample size for the impact of training analysis was also small, with a further reduction at follow-up. This low follow-up response rate (61%) may reflect the fact that follow-up contact was made by email rather than face to face, and also that some practitioners had since left the service. This study should therefore be considered a preliminary investigation of a new measure, which warrants further replication.

Conclusion

Analyses of this measure yielded a single factor structure for this sample. The measure appears to have good psychometric properties, although this finding requires replication, and the scale appeared sensitive to change in confidence following the delivery of training. This measure could be clinically useful in evaluating and developing training focussed on the currently recommended approach to the assessment, formulation and management of suicide risk.

REFERENCES

- Buckingham, C. D., Adams, A., & Mace, C. (2008). Cues and knowledge structures used by mental-health professionals when making risk assessments. *Journal of Mental Health, 17*(3), 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638230701498374>
- Chongtham, V., Gupta, N., & Chavan, B. S. (2015). Structuring and self-competence: How they can make a difference in assessing and managing risk. *Indian Journal of Social Psychiatry, 31*(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0971-9962.161999>
- Dagnan, D., Masson, J., Cavagin, A., Thwaites, R., & Hatton, C. (2015). The Development of a Measure of Confidence in Delivering Therapy to People with Intellectual Disabilities: Confidence in Delivering Therapy to People with Intellectual Disabilities. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 22*(5), 392–398. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1898>
- Delgadillo, J., Moreea, O., Outhwaite-Luke, H., Dace, T., Nicholls, B., Ramseyer, G., & Dale, V. (2014). Confidence in the face of risk: The Risk Assessment and Management Self-Efficacy Study (RAMSES). *Psychiatric Bulletin, 38*(2), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.112.040394>
- Department of Health. (2007). *Best practice in managing risk*.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478595/best-practice-managing-risk-cover-webtagged.pdf
- Department of Health. (2017). *Preventing suicide in England: Third progress report of the cross-government outcomes strategy to save lives*.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/582117/Suicide_report_2016_A.pdf
- Doyle, M., Earnshaw, P., & Galloway, A. (2003). Developing, delivering and evaluating interprofessional clinical risk training in mental health services. *The Psychiatrist, 27*(2), 73–76.

- Graney, J., Hunt, I. M., Quinlivan, L., Rodway, C., Turnbull, P., Gianatsi, M., Appleby, L., & Kapur, N. (2020). Suicide risk assessment in UK mental health services: A national mixed-methods study. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(12), 1046–1053. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30381-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30381-3)
- Holgado–Tello, F. P., Chacón–Moscoso, S., Barbero–García, I., & Vila–Abad, E. (2010). Polychoric versus Pearson correlations in exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis of ordinal variables. *Quality & Quantity*, 44(1), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-008-9190-y>
- Kirtley, O., Hussey, I., & Marzano, L. (2020). *Exposure to and experience of self-harm and self-harm related content: An exploratory network analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gyhxr>
- Lewis, G., & Doyle, M. (2009). Risk Formulation: What are We Doing and Why? *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 8(4), 286–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14999011003635696>
- Maina, R., Bukusi, D., & Kumar, M. (2019). Suicide prevention by emergency nurses: Perceived self-efficacy in assessment, management and referral at Kenyatta National Hospital in Kenya. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 18(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-019-0240-8>
- NCISH, National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health. (2018). *The assessment of clinical risk in mental health services* (p. 26). University of Manchester.
- Nock, M. K., Deming, C. A., Fullerton, C. S., Gilman, S. E., Goldenberg, M., Kessler, R. C., McCarroll, J. E., McLaughlin, K. A., Peterson, C., Schoenbaum, M., Stanley, B., & Ursano, R. J. (2013). Suicide Among Soldiers: A Review of Psychosocial Risk and Protective Factors. *Psychiatry*, 76(2), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2013.76.2.97>
- Nowok, B., Dibben, C., & Raab, G. M. (2019). *Recognising real people in synthetic microdata: Risk mitigation and impact on utility*. 9.
- Nowok, B., Raab, G. M., Dibben, C., Snoke, J., & Lissa, C. van. (2020). *synthpop: Generating Synthetic Versions of Sensitive Microdata for Statistical Disclosure Control* (1.6-0) [Computer software]. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=synthpop>
- 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.

- Quinlivan, L., Cooper, J., Meehan, D., Longson, D., Potokar, J., Hulme, T., Marsden, J., Brand, F., Lange, K., Riseborough, E., Page, L., Metcalfe, C., Davies, L., O'Connor, R., Hawton, K., Gunnell, D., & Kapur, N. (2017). Predictive Accuracy of Risk Scales Following Self-Harm: Multicentre, Prospective Cohort Study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 210(6), 429–436. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.116.189993>
- R: *The R Project for Statistical Computing*. (2019). Retrieved 14 December 2020, from <https://www.r-project.org/>
- Revelle, W. (2018). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research* (1.8.12) [Computer software]. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (n.d.). *General Self-Efficacy Scale*. www.midss.ie
- Simms, L. J., Zelazny, K., Williams, T. F., & Bernstein, L. (2019). Does the number of response options matter? Psychometric perspectives using personality questionnaire data. *Psychological Assessment*, 31(4), 557–566. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000648>
- Steeg, S., Quinlivan, L., Nowland, R., Carroll, R., Casey, D., Clements, C., Cooper, J., Davies, L., Knipe, D., Ness, J., O'Connor, R. C., Hawton, K., Gunnell, D., & Kapur, N. (2018). Accuracy of risk scales for predicting repeat self-harm and suicide: A multicentre, population-level cohort study using routine clinical data. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1693-z>
- The jamovi project*. (2020). <https://www.jamovi.org/about.html>
- Vail, L., Adams, A., Gilbert, E., Nettleingham, A., & Buckingham, C. D. (2012). Investigating mental health risk assessment in primary care and the potential role of a structured decision support tool, GRiST. *Mental Health in Family Medicine*, 9(1), 57–67.
- 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 Organization. (2014). *Preventing suicide: A global imperative*. World Health Organization. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/131056>
- World Health Organization. (2018). *National suicide prevention strategies: Progress, examples and indicators*. <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/279765/9789241515016-eng.pdf?ua=1>

World Health Organization. (2019). *Suicide in the world*. <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/suicide-in-the-world>

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.

Zaher, N. A., & Buckingham, C. D. (2017). Moderating the Influence of Current Intention to Improve Suicide Risk Prediction. *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, 2016, 1274–1282.

Appendix 1: Participants by occupational group (N=128).

	N(%)	Mean on new Scale.	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
High Intensity Cognitive Behavioural Therapist	45(35)	32.36	6.87	19	48
Psychological Wellbeing Practitioner	34(27)	27.74	7.33	10	37
Counsellor	7(5)	29.14	4.14	24	34
Team Leader	4(3)	37.25	2.22	34	39
Assessment and Triage Practitioner	8(6)	30.25	12.16	18	51
Senior Psychotherapist	2(2)	36.50	14.85	26	47
Older Adult Mental Health	28(22)	30.61	8.58	6	40

Appendix 2: Training group demographics (N=85).

	N(%)	MeanAge (SD*)	Mean Years in role (SD*)	Mean Years in Mental Health (SD*)
High Intensity Cognitive Behavioural Therapist	39(46)	46.5 (9.4)	3.6 (2.2)	12.8 (7.8)
Psychological Wellbeing Practitioner	26(31)	32.6(10.3)	2.7 (3.0)	4.9 (3.6)
Counsellor	6(7)	52.7 (2.4)	6.0 (5.8)	13.7 (4.0)
Team Leader	4(5)	47.8 (3.7)	2.3 (1.7)	22.8 (10.0)
Assessment and Triage Practitioner	8(9)	37 (7.8)	0.8 (1.5)	7.4 (9.9)
Senior Psychotherapist	2(2)	50 (7.1)	3.5 (3.5)	24 (15.6)
Total	85(100)	41.9 (11.4)	3.2 (2.9)	10.7 (8.4)

*SD = Standard Deviation

Appendix 3: *Training group mean scores*

	Risk Confidence	GCSE
n = 52	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Pre-training	29.21(7.73)	12.71(1.89)
Post-training	34.12(5.80)	13.53(2.10)
Follow-up	33.15(5.78)	13.16(2.81)

Table 1: *Scale Factor Loadings (n = 128)*

	Item	Item mean	Standard Deviation (SD)	Corrected Item-total correlation	Factor Loadings
	How confident are you that you can....				
1	Use GRiST to assess risk of suicide?	1.14	1.14	0.48*	n/a*
2	Use your clinical skills to gather suicide risk information from patients?	2.74	0.66	0.72	0.774
3	Identify a person who presents a risk of suicide?	2.66	0.70	0.75	0.804
4	Communicate a suicide risk management plan to appropriate colleagues and services?	2.39	0.87	0.84	0.903
5	Identify relevant historic predisposing factors?	2.45	0.77	0.82	0.887
6	Identify relevant precipitating (current and future) factors?	2.53	0.70	0.83	0.914
7	Identify relevant perpetuating factors?	2.38	0.73	0.82	0.896
8	Identify relevant protective factors?	2.72	0.65	0.78	0.837
9	Combine general and individual risk factors into a suicide risk formulation?	2.12	0.85	0.81	0.811
10	Use the information from your formulation to develop an individual risk management plan?	2.16	0.94	0.84	0.851
11	Identify an appropriate service to refer someone to on the basis of risk?	2.45	0.82	0.74	0.736
12	Develop rapport with people who present significant risk of suicide?	2.64	0.81	0.69	0.725
13	Help people to minimise the risk of suicide?	2.27	0.84	0.77	0.790

*item excluded from scale.

Note. 'Maximum Likelihood' extraction method was used in combination with a 'oblimin' rotation for factor analysis

