



# **Ethical implications of using family key informants to understand the transgenerational impact of severe mental illnesses in rural Ethiopia**

*Wubalem Fekadu, Tom K.J. Craig, Abebaw Fekadu*



# Introduction

**□ There may be particular ethical challenges working with people with severe mental illness**

- In close-knit communities
- Where stigma is high
- Where families take a dominant role in decision-making

# Aim of the project

- **To explore lived experience of people with severe mental illness, their family members and community members**
- **To investigate the transgenerational impact of illness**
  - Multidimensional poverty
  - Mortality
  - Food insecurity and family satisfaction
- **Compared households of people with SMI and matched controls in rural Ethiopia**





# Project overview



- **The project was nested within an existing population-based cohort on SMI**
  - Established between 1998-2001
  - Two predominantly rural districts of Meskan and Mareko
  - Mental health care is provided in the hospital psychiatric nurse outpatient clinic

# Project overview

- **We collected data from three sources for the qualitative study**
  - People with SMI, family members and community members
  - Multiple perspectives on the situation
- **For the quantitative study**
  - One adult key informant nominated by the household members
  - Family tree used as a framework



# Ethical concerns

## Involvement and privacy

- ❑ People with SMI **expressed disappointment** when they were left out of the conversation
- ❑ Perspectives of individuals with the illness
  - **They can speak for themselves**
  - **Their family members may tell the researcher or clinician “my secret”**
  - **The interviewer may share their secrets**

# Autonomy

## ☐ **Who decides who can talk about a person?**

- Right to know and decide for themselves
- Decide who else speaks about them

## ☐ **Active engagement with people with SMI**

- Has the potential to improve therapeutic alliance in clinic
- Trusting relationships that produce credible data in research

## ☐ **Possible justification for not involving**

- Periodically relapsing symptoms that may interfere with capacity to consent and affect recall of past events

# Discrimination and anonymity

## ❑ People with SMI and their family members reported

- Deep-rooted stigma and discrimination in the public against them

## ❑ Community members reported that

- People with SMI and their family members were excluded from support systems, such as financial safety net programs

## ❑ Anonymity difficult in a close-knit community but essential to prevent social exclusion

---



# Conclusion and recommendations

## ❑ Major ethical challenges in mental health research in our setting

- Autonomy
- Privacy and maintaining anonymity
- Human rights
- Equity

# Conclusion and recommendations

## □ The main lesson from our project

- Allowing people with SMI to speak for themselves and decide who can speak about them
- It is important to uphold the right of people with SMI to be involved in research
- It is critical that researchers ensure anonymity when involving people with SMI and other community members in the same investigation

# Other initiatives from Ethiopia

- Empowerment activities to support involvement of people with lived experience of SMI in the planning and execution of research projects, as well as being the subjects of research

*Abayneh et al. (2020)*

- Research can drive change within communities
  - E.g., Community advisory boards for projects can reduce stigma and expand access to mental health care

*Fekadu et al. (2020)*

# Thank you

