

about Mental Illness among Awareness Family Members of Psychiatric Patient attending **Psychiatric Outpatient Department of Bharatpur Hospital**

Rama Kumari Lamichhane 1 Asha Thapa 1 Bijaya Dhakal 1 Thapa 1 Bijaya Dhakal 1 Thapa Kamala Regmi 1 Pratima Adhikari 10 Pratima ¹Department of Nursing, ¹ Bharatpur Hospital Nursing College, Bharatpur Chitwan, Nepal.



ABSTRACT

Background

Mental health issues have emerged as a significant concern in today's landscape. It is crucial for family members to be aware of mental illness to provide effective care for their loved ones at home. Awareness plays a key role in the early detection of mental health problems. This study seeks to assess the level of awareness of mental illness among the family members of psychiatric patients.

Methods

This study utilized a cross-sectional research design to assess the awareness of mental illness among the family members of psychiatric patients visiting the Psychiatric Outpatient Department of Bharatpur Hospital from August to December, 2024. A non-probability purposive sampling technique was employed to select the sample, which consisted of 325 family members. A self-constructed, structured questionnaire was used to interview the participants and evaluate their level of awareness. Chi-square analysis performed to examine the association between demographic variables and level of awareness with a significance level set at p < 0.05.

Results

Among 325 family members, 306 (94.15%) had heard about mental illness, of these, 164 (53.6%) of the respondents had poor level of awareness. No significant association was found between level of awareness and sociodemographic variables of the participants.

Conclusions

The Study revealed that more than half of the respondents had poor level of awareness about mental illness. These finding highlight the need for targeted interventions to improve awareness among family members, which could contribute to better management of psychiatric patients.

Keywords: awareness, mental illness, family members.

Correspondence: Mrs. Rama Kumari Lamichhane, Department of Nursing, Bharatpur Hospital Nursing College, Bharatpur Chitwan, Nepal. Email: ramalamichhane77@gmail.com, Phone: +977-9845153178. Article received: 2024-11-28. Article accepted: 2025-02-17. Article published: 2025-03-25.

INTRODUCTION

Mental illness is a Mental and behavioral disorders are understood as clinically significant conditions characterized by alteration in thinking, mood (emotion) or behavior associated with personal distress and or impaired functioning.1 One in four people in the world will be affected by mental or neurological disorders at some point in their lives. Around 450 million people currently suffer from such conditions, placing mental disorders among the leading causes of ill-health and disability worldwide.2 An estimate of 30% of the population of Nepal is suffering from psychiatric problems. Neuropsychiatric disorders are among the leading causes of worldwide disability in young people.³ The gap in the treatment is still high, especially in low and middle-income countries.4 Families are important resources in the recovery of mentally ill persons, who rely on family members psychologically, emotionally and/or economically. However, in such situations, families experience heavy burdens of care giving. Moreover, they also suffer from the significant stigma of having a family member with a mental illness.5 Lack of financial resources and low mental health literacy, in particular misconceptions about mental health problems and stigma associated with mental health problems, contribute to delay or obstruct access to treatment for individuals in Nepal.⁶ A study of 21 countries with the World Health Organization (WHO) Mental Health Surveys found that 52.6% of persons with depressive disorder in low-income countries received any treatment in the past 12 months, and only 20.5% of persons with depressive disorder received minimally adequate treatment. Studies have documented several adverse consequences of untreated mental illness including pre-mature mortality, unemployment, poverty, homelessness, co-morbid substance abuse and addiction, poor physical health and suicide.4 Knowledge of family member about the mental illness is imperative in caring the patients with mental illness. Overall knowledge about mental illness was found to be toward the higher side. Another study present that caregivers had poor knowledge about mental illness.8 A study conducted in Nepal present that (41.60%)

of the respondents had poor level of awareness.⁹ This study evaluates the awareness of mental illness among family members of psychiatric patient.

METHODS

A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted to assess the level of awareness about mental illness among family members of psychiatric patients visiting the psychiatric outpatient department (OPD) of Bharatpur Hospital, Chitwan, Nepal, from August to December 2024. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Committee of Bharatpur Hospital, and written informed consent was obtained before data collection. Participants who met the inclusion criteria were recruited for the study using a purposive sampling method. The sample size was determined using the following formula. By taking prevalence from the study conducted by Aryal et al., as 25.7% with 5% margin of error and 95% CI sample size was calculated using Cochran formula as $n = Z\alpha 2PQ/d2 = 296$. To minimize non-response error, an additional 10% was included, resulting in a total sample size of 325. A structured interview schedule was used, incorporating socio-demographic variables and factors related to awareness of mental illness. Data collection was conducted with each participant within 20-25 minutes, ensuring confidentiality and restricting access to the information solely for research purposes. After data collection, responses were checked for completeness and stored for further analysis. The data was analyzed using SPSS version 26, applying both descriptive and inferential statistical methods. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Among the 325 participants, more than half (55.4%) were under the age of 40, with a mean age of 40.75 years (SD = 17.64). Additionally, more than half (55.1%) were female. In terms of residence, the majority (52.6%) lived in the Mahanagarpalika area. A large proportion (73.2%) of the respondents were married. More than half (58.2%) of the respondents were from belong to nuclear family. Regarding

Table 1. Socio-dem patient's (n=325)	ographic Cha	racteristics (f
Variables		n(%)	
Age			
>40		180(55.4)	
<40		145(44.6)	
Mean±SD	40.75±17.64		
Sex			
Male		146(44.9)	
Female		179(55.1)	
Area of residence			
Mahanagrpalika		171(52.6)	
Nagarpalika		107(32.9)	
V.D.C		47(14.5)	
Marital Status			
Married		238(73.2)	
Unmarried		79(24.3)	
Widow		8(2.5)	
Type of family			
Nuclear		189(58.2)	
Joint		130(40)	
Extended		6(1.8)	
Education status			
Literate		255(78.5)	
Illiterate		70(21.5)	
Occupation			
Service		76(23.4)	
Business		40(12.3)	
Agriculture		77(23.7)	
Students		51(15.7)	
unemployment		25(7.7)	
Housemaker		28(8.6)	
Others		28(8.6)	
educational backgr	round, most	responder	ıts

educational background, most respondents (78.5%) were literate and (23.7%) were engaged in agriculture as their primary occupation. Among the 325 participants, more than half (57.2%) were under the age of 40, with a mean age of 39.91 years (SD = 13.43). Additionally, more than half (51.7%) were female. In terms of residence, the majority (56.6%) lived in the Mahanagarpalika area. A large proportion (89.5%) of the respondents were married. Regarding educational background, most respondents (90.5%) were literate. Over one-quarter (28.0%) were engaged in agriculture as their primary occupation. In terms of family relationships, more than one-quarter (30.5%)

Respondents (n=325) Variables n(%) Age 186(57.2) <40 year 139(42.8) Mean±SD 39.91+13.43() Sex 157(48.3) Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika Magarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
>40 year 186(57.2) <40 year 139(42.8) Mean±SD 39.91+13.43() Sex Male 157(48.3) Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status Married 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
<40 year
Mean±SD 39.91+13.43() Sex Male 157(48.3) Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Sex Male 157(48.3) Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Male 157(48.3) Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika Magarpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Female 168(51.7) Area of residence Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status Married 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Area of residence Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Mahanagrpalika 184(56.6) Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Nagarpalika 102(31.4) V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
V.D.C 37(11.4) Marital Status Married 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Marital Status Married 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Married 291(89.5) Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Unmarried 30(9.2) Widow 4(1.2)
Widow 4(1.2)
True of fourth.
Type of family
Nuclear 181(55.7)
Joint 136(41.8)
Extended 6(2.5)
Education status
Literate 294(90.5)
Illiterate 31(9.5)
Occupation
Service 86(26.5)
Business 60(18.5)
Agriculture 91(28)
Students 27(8.3)
unemployment 14(4.3)
Housemaker 24(7.4)
Others 23(7.1)
Relation with Patient
Parents 99(30.5)
Children 64(19.7)
Partne 90(27.7)
Sibling 20(6.2)
Other 52(16)
Stay with living
<20 year 178(54.8)
>20year 147(45.2)

were parents themselves. More than half (54.8%) had lived in the area for less than 20 years.

Out of 306 participants more than two third of Table 3 Awareness about mental illness (n=306)

able 3. Awareness about mental illness (n=306)		
Variables	Frequency (%)	
Meaning of mental illness * Medical condition which needs	254(78.2)	
treatment		
Brain dysfunction or biological	187(57.5)	
dysfunction		
Gods curse for past sins	96(29.5)	
Causes of mental illness *		
Life Stress	266(81.8)	
God punishment for past sins	161(49.5)	
Black Magic	108(33.2)	
Hereditary	137(42.2)	
Supernatural Power	102(31.4)	
Types of mental illness*		
Depression	268(82.5)	
Schizophrenia	156(58)	
Bipolar	137(42.2)	
Signs and symptoms of mental il	lness*	
Cannot held responsibility for his/	232(71.4)	
her own actions		
Prone to violent W	185(56.9)	
Unable to make simple decision	161(49.5)	
for themselves		
Split personality	155(47.7)	
Serious bout of depression	139(42.8)	

Table 5. Level of awareness among family members of the psychiatric patient (n=306)

Level of awareness	Frequency (%)
Poor level	164(53.6)
Good level	142(46.4)

the respondents (78.2%) view mental illness as a Medical condition which needs treatment. In terms of cause (81.8%) consider life stress. Regarding types (82.5%) has stated depression. Whereas in signs and symptoms (71.4%) has stated Cannot held responsibility for his/her own actions. Most of respondents 78.2% stated being sad and unhappy most of the time as risk factors. In terms of preventive measures, more than one third 78.2% has stated avoid stressful and hectic

Table 4. Awareness on Risk factor	s, Preventive
measures and treatment of Menta	l illness (n=306)
Variables	Frequency (%)
Risk factors for mental illness*	
Being sad and unhappy most of the	254(78.2)
time Busy and hectic lifestyle	187(57.5)
Failing a romantic relationship	140(43.1)
Traumatic childhood	116(35.7)
Prevention of mental illness*	
Avoid stressful and hectic lifestyle	250(76.9)
Avoid excessive alcohol	172(52.9)
Daily worshiping	137(42.2)
Adaptation of positive lifestyle	194(59.7)
Is mental Illness treated	
Yes	284(87.4)
No	41(12.6)
Treatment person*	
Psychiatric	257(79.1)
Physician	150(46.2)
Traditional healer	148(45.5)
Treatment place *	
Hospital	230(70.8)
Home	184(56.6)
Community	131(40.3)

Table 6. Association between sociodemographic variables and level of wareness(n=306)

Variable	Level of Awareness		χ2	P-value
	Poor	Good		
Age				
<40	93	83	0.1	0.75
>40	71	59		
Sex				
Male	77	71	0.28	0.59
Female	87	71		
Education	status			
Literate	146	131	0.92	0.33
Illiterate	18	11		
Family				
type Single	96	77	0.57	0.44
Joint	68	65		
Living with	h patient(in a year)		
< 20	87	80	0.33	0.56
>20	77	62		

^{*} Chi square significant p<0.05 at 95% confidence level

lifestyle. Most of 87.4% of respondents stated mental illness is treated. Out of them 79.1% of the respondent's states that psychiatric doctors treated mental illness and 70.8% of respondents stated that hospital is treated mental ill individual Table 5 indicate that more than half (53.6%) of the respondent had poor level awareness, more than one third (46.4%) of the respondents had good level of awareness. Table 6 presents association between selected demographic variable and level of awareness. There was no significant association of age with level of awareness at 95% of significance level (p-value=0.75). There was no significant association of gender with level of awareness at 95% significance level(p-value=0.59). There was no significant association of type of family with level of awareness at 95% significance level (p-value=0.44). There was no significant association of education status with level of awareness at 95% of significance level (p-value=0.33).

DISCUSSION

This study found that a significant majority of participants (94.15% of 325) were familiar with mental illness, a finding consistent with other studies conducted in Nepal.9 Among the 306 participants, over two-thirds (78.2%) viewed mental illness as a medical condition that requires treatment. This study supported by (88%) Medical condition which needs treatment. 10 The findings of the study in terms of causes 31.2% believes mental illness as a result of supernatural power wWWhich is supported with the findings of the study conducted in Delhi which states one fourth of participants perceived the role of supernatural powers as causative factor. 11 The findings of the study in terms of causes 81.8% believes mental illness as a result of life stress which is supported with finding of Singh et al., reported stressful conditions as a cause for development of mental illness.12 On the part of sign and symptoms of mental illness all participants (71.4%) believes that mentally ill people cannot held responsibility for his/her own actions and are prone to be violent whereas most of respondents

56.9% believes that they are unable to make simple decisions for themselves. These findings of this study are similar with the findings of the study conducted in Urban Community in South Delhi which showed awareness of the community about symptoms/signs of mental illness is limited to symptoms that manifest in severe mental illness or in later stage of the illness. 11 More than half (53.6%) of the respondent had poor level of awareness, more than one third (46.4%) of the respondents had good level of awareness. In contrast with the study findings, study from Assam shows average knowledge of family members about mental illness was considerably higher.7A study conducted in new Delhi India reported that Knowledge of mental illness among the general public was quite poor which is supported to presented study.¹³ Present study was supported by a study conducted in Nepal revealed that nearly half 42 (41.6%) of the respondent had poor level of awareness.9 Similar study conducted in Ethiopia 55.3% of the respondents had poor knowledge about mental illness which is supported by present study.14 This finding is contrast by many other studies conducted in Nepal in 2021 which reported that 97.8% had adequate knowledge level.¹⁰ On the supported, study conducted by Mojiminiyi in 2020 revealed that half of the respondents (51.2%) had poor knowledge.¹⁵ Present study shows that there were no significant association of age, gender, type of family and education status with level of awareness. The finding was contrast with study finding shows that Knowledge about mental illness was found significantly correlated with family members' age (r = 0.254, P = 0.007) and caregiving duration (P = 0.268, P = 0.004). Family members' gender and relationship with patients were found to be significantly associated with knowledge of mental illness.7 This finding was contrast by the study conducted by Sinha et.al. in 2020 which showed association of knowledge with education status.¹⁶ This finding was supported by the study conducted in Assam which showed no association of knowledge with education status.7 The finding was contrast with study finding shows that Knowledge about mental illness was found significantly

correlated with family members' age (P = 0.001) and Family members' gender (p=0.001) relationship with patients were found to be significantly associated with knowledge of mental illness.¹³

CONCLUSIONS

The Study revealed that more than half of the respondents had poor level of awareness about mental illness. There were no significant association of age, gender, type of family and education status with level of awareness. Hence, the present study results indicate the need to include some interventions like psychoeducation for the family members routinely during follow-up visits for the patients. The poor awareness about mental illness suggests the need for strong emphasis on public education to increase mental health literacy

among general public to increase awareness.

Acknowledgement

Firstly, I would like to thank IRC of Bharatpur Hospital for ethical clearance to conduct this study. Additionally, I would like to acknowledge all study participants for their support during data collection. I also would like to express my gratitude to all other supporting hands contributed to the completion of this research.

Conflict of interest: None

Funding: This is funded research by Bharatpur Hospital as health research grant for the year 2024.

REFERENCES

- Sreevani R. A Guide to Mental Health & Psychiatric Nursing [Internet]. jaypee; 2016 [cited 2025 Jan 21]. [DOI]
- The World Health Report 2001: Mental Disorders affect one in four people [Internet]. [cited 2025 Jan 21]. [Link]
- 3. Uprety S, Lamichhane B. MENTAL HEALTH IN NEPAL. [Link]
- 4. Luitel NP, Jordans MJD, Kohrt BA, Rathod SD, Komproe IH. Treatment gap and barriers for mental health care: A cross-sectional community survey in Nepal. Abe T, editor. PLOS ONE [Internet]. 2017 Aug 17 [cited 2025 Jan 21];12(8):e0183223. [DOI]
- Jönsson PD, Skärsäter I, Wijk H, Danielson E. Experience of living with a family member with bipolar disorder: BIPOLAR DISORDER IN THE FAMILY. Int J Ment Health Nurs [Internet]. 2011 Feb [cited 2025 Jan 21];20(1):29–37. [DOI]
- Luitel NP, Jordans MJ, Adhikari A, Upadhaya N, Hanlon C, Lund C, et al. Mental health care in Nepal: current situation and challenges for development of a district mental health care plan. Confl Health [Internet]. 2015 Dec [cited]

2025 Jan 21];9(1):3. [DOI]

- 7. Ahmed N, Baruah A. Awareness about mental illness among the family members of persons with mental illness in a selected District of Assam. Indian J Soc Psychiatry [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2025 Jan 21];33(2):171. [DOI]
- 8. Gabra RH, Ebrahim OS, Osman DMM, Al-Attar GST. Knowledge, attitude and healthseeking behavior among family caregivers of mentally ill patients at Assiut University Hospitals: a cross-sectional study. Middle East Curr Psychiatry [Internet]. 2020 Mar 17 [cited 2025 Jan 21];27(1):10. [DOI]
- 9. Aryal R, Pun K, Belbase D, Panthi M. Awareness on mental illness and delayed in seeking health services among members of psychiatric patient. Int J Med Sci Public Health [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2025 Jan 21];(0):1. [Link]
- Jha P, Mandal PK. Knowledge And Attitude On Mental Illness Among People Of A Selected Community Of Biratnagar. J Psychiatr Assoc Nepal [Internet]. 2021 Oct 14 [cited 2025 Jan 22];10(1):43–9. [Link]
- 11. Salve H, Goswami K, Sagar R, Nongkynrih B, Sreenivas V. Perception and Attitude towards Mental Illness in an Urban Community in South

- Delhi A Community Based Study. Indian J Psychol Med. 2013 Apr;35(2):154–8. [DOI]
- 12. Singh AJ, Shukla GD, Verma BL, Kumar A, Srivastava RN. Attitude of Indian urban adults towards mental illnesses. Indian J Public Health. 1992;36(2):51–4. [PubMed]
- 13. Sanaa M. KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF MENTAL ILLNESS AMONG GENERAL PUBLIC OF SOUTHERN INDIA. [cited 2025 Jan 22]. [Link]
- 14. Birkie M, Anbesaw T. Knowledge, attitude, and associated factors towards mental illness among

- residents of Dessie town, northeast, Ethiopia, a cross-sectional study. BMC Psychiatry [Internet]. 2021 Dec [cited 2025 Jan 21];21(1):614. [DOI]
- 15. Mojiminiyi IO, Balogun MR, Ogunnowo BE. Knowledge and attitude towards mental disorders among adults in an urban community in south-west Nigeria. Malawi Med J J Med Assoc Malawi. 2020 Jun;32(2):87–94. [DOI]
- 16. Sinha S, Manna M, Roy J. Assessment of the Knowledge and Attitude of Adults Regarding Mental Illness in Selected Rural Community, West Bengal. 2020;(8). [Link]

Citation: Lamichhane RK, Thapa A, Dhakal B, Regmi K, Adhikari P. Awareness about Mental Illness among the Family Members of Psychiatric Patient attending Psychiatric Outpatient Department of Bharatpur Hospital. JoBH, Nepal. 2025; 1(1): 40-46.