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**Societal**
- Poverty
- High crime levels
- High residential mobility
- Local illicit drug trade
- Weak institutional policies
- Inadequate victim care services
- Inadequate community cohesion

**Community**
- Psychological/personality disturbance (d/o)
- Alcohol/substance abuse
- Victim of child maltreatment or current abuse
- Violent behavior—past or current
- Suicidal behavior—past or current
- Access to lethal means

**Relationship**
- Exposure to poor parenting or violent parental conflict
- Fractured family structures
- Family history of suicide
- Current relationship/marital turmoil—participant in intimate violence
- Financial, work stress; under- or unemployed
- Friends & family that engage in violence

**Individual**
- Unstable social infrastructure
- Economic insecurity
- Discrimination: gender; race; other
- Policies that increase inequalities
- Poverty
- Weak economic safety nets
- Cultural norms that support violence
- Access to lethal methods (firearms)
Objectives for Today

To provide a basis for considering IPV in suicide and murder-suicide research & vice versa.
What Are We To Do?

• Headlines relay violence is a global issue.
• US Policy makers rise to the call – albeit briefly, and sometimes with feel-good legislation.
• Are things getting worse?
Homicides of intimates by gender and race of victim, 1976-2005
Number of victims

BJS, http://www.bjs.gov/content/intimate/victims.cfm
BASIC CBPR PRINCIPLES

- Collaborate in All Phases
- Build Strength & Action
- Community As Unit of Identity
- Address Health
- Integrates Knowledge and Action
- Co-Learning
- Cyclical and Iterative Process
- Disseminates Findings
How Does IPV Impact Suicide & Murder Suicide?

- Victim
- Perpetrator
- Bystander
- Children
Suicide Threats Suicide Attempts

According to Petitioners, 46 Respondents (45.5%) had a history of threatened suicide.

13 subjects had a history of suicide attempts (12.9%).

Unlike threats, most attempts were not recent.
Petitioners Expressed Suicidal Thoughts/Behaviors

Almost 1/3 discussed suicidal ideation or prior attempts

Thirty-one women (17.2%) reported current suicidal ideation, an elevated prevalence compared to community surveys, with 29 reporting

- “I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out” and 2
- endorsing “I would like to kill myself.”

Women endorsing suicidal ideation did not differ from other women on the

- DA, 16.8 (7.8) vs. 18.6 (8.2)
- CTS, 16.94 (11.6) vs. 19.7 (10.9).
- CESD
  - 40.3 (7.0) vs. 26.5 (12.3), p<.001.
Danger Assessment v. FCP 2010

Nichols-Hadeed, 2012
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Study Design

Create Curriculum

Pre-Training Observation/ Curriculum Modification

Informed Consent

Yes
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Collect Age, Race, & Gender Give Training

Two Day Training
Pre & Post Training Assessments
Day 1 – Deliver Curriculum
Day 2 – Role Play

3- Months Self Assessment – Knowledge, Attitude & Efficacy
Silent Monitoring.

6-Months Self Assessment –

7-12 Months Curriculum Modification

Booster Session
# Self-Monitoring Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caller #</th>
<th>Invitations</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hopelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatigue/Depressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Useless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indecision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choice Suicide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Dying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore Invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If Yes, Means?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase I

• Observation & Silent Monitoring
• Focus Groups – Four Held
• Transcription and Coding
  – Framework analysis (Pope)
  – Suicide is an issue for hotline
  – Identified more readily when trained
  – Personal histories play a role
  – Timing and length of calls
What About Veterans?
BLUEPRINT FOR CHANGE

- Science
  What does the data tell us?

- Practice
  What is really going to work?

- Resources
  What money is available?
Resources


