INTRODUCTION

According to the World Health Organization, major depressive disorder (MDD) will become the second largest cause of disability in the world and the leading cause in the developed countries by 2020 [1]. Based on research conducted in Serbia in 2000, MDD was ranked as the fourth most prevalent disorder among 18 health disorders [2]. Despite the relatively high prevalence of mental disorders, many affected people do not receive any sort of professional help [3]. One of the reasons for the lack of appropriate treatments is the absence of help-seeking behavior. One study suggested that early help-seeking for mental health problems promotes early intervention and positive long-term outcomes [4]. There are multiple factors related to the poor help-seeking behavior and one is low mental health literacy [5].

Mental health literacy is important so that not only the person affected can recognize a mental disorder and seek appropriate help, but also family members and close friends, who can spot early signs and direct the person towards appropriate professionals. Although numerous studies have explored mental health literacy in different countries [5, 6, 7], to the best of our knowledge, this construct has not been examined in Serbia. Determination of the current level of mental health literacy in Serbia could help in the identification of specific areas for improvement and could aid the tailoring of education programs concerning mental health. Similar actions were realized in Australia through a National Survey of Mental Health Literacy in 1995, in which specific areas for improvement were pinpointed and then a campaign for increasing mental health literacy was implemented. The results of the most recent study indicated that there has been a significant progress in recognizing different kinds of mental illnesses over the years, an increase in beliefs about the effectiveness of specific treatments prescribed by mental health specialist, and beliefs about the efficiency of medications, especially antidepressants [8].

The present cross-sectional survey was designed to provide an initial overview of the current mental health literacy and attitudes in a sample of the general population in the Republic of Serbia towards persons who experienced major depressive disorder.
symptoms of MDD. The objectives of the present study were to examine (1) the public's recognition of the symptoms of MDD and their beliefs about the causes of depression and the effectiveness of various treatments, (2) attitudes towards people with mental illness, and (3) to explore the correlation among socio-demographic factors and the attitudes towards people with mental illness in the sample of the general population in Serbia.

METHODS

Sample

The convenient sample consisted of 504 participants from different cities in the Republic of Serbia. The majority of the sample (60.1%) had a high school diploma, followed by a bachelor’s degree (32.5%), middle school diploma (4.2%), and a master’s or a doctoral degree (3.2%). Table 1 presents more information on the demographic characteristics of the sample.

| Parameter | Age range (years) | Total |
|-----------|-------------------|-------|
|            | 17–19             | 20–39 | 40–59 | 60–80 |       |
| Sex        |                   |       |       |       |       |
| Male       | Count             | 23    | 161   | 45    | 3     | 232   |
|           | Within sex        | 9.9   | 69.4  | 19.4  | 1.3   | 100%  |
|           | Within age range  | 50    | 46.9  | 42.9  | 30    | 46.0% |
| Female     | Count             | 23    | 182   | 60    | 7     | 272   |
|           | Within sex        | 8.5   | 66.9  | 22.1  | 2.6   | 100%  |
|           | within age range  | 50    | 53.1  | 57.1  | 70    | 54%   |
| Total      |                   | 46    | 343   | 105   | 10    | 504   |
|            | Within sex        | 9.1   | 68.1  | 20.8  | 2     | 100%  |
|            | Within age range  | 100   | 100   | 100   | 100   | 100%  |
| Median     |                   |       |       |       |       | 25    |
| Mean       |                   |       |       |       |       | 30.59 |
| SD         |                   |       |       |       |       | 12.23 |

The instruments were administrated by fourth-semester students at the Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation of the University of Belgrade, trained in conducting the interview and administering the questionnaires. Each student was asked to apply the questionnaires to six respondents of different sex, age, and level of education during 2016. The students recruited the participants via personal contacts or by word of mouth and conducted an individual interview with each participant. All the participants were informed that their responses would stay anonymous and they provided verbal consent. The participants were interviewed in person and none of the questionnaires were self-administered. The study was done in accord with standards of the institutional committee on ethics.

Instruments and procedure

After the participants provided their consent for participation, they completed several demographic questions (sex, age, and level of education), followed by a series of questions related to the variety of their contacts with persons with a mental illness. The participants were asked close-ended questions, such as, “Have you ever lived, or do you live now with a person with a mental illness?”

To assess the components of mental health literacy, a vignette of a person suffering from a mental disorder, without disclosing the diagnosis, was presented. The vignette was developed by Jorm et al. [7] and described a person who met ICD-10 criteria for MDD.

After being shown the vignette, an interview with closed-ended questions was conducted. In the first part of the interview, the participants were asked four yes/no questions related to their experience with symptoms similar to those depicted in the vignette.

In the second part of the interview, the questions used in the study by Jorm et al. [7] were applied. The respondents were asked two open-ended questions: “What, if anything, is wrong with Maria?” and “What kind of help does Maria need?” The rest of the interview consisted of questions aimed at determining the respondents’ rating on the three-point Likert scale about different sources of help and about the effectiveness of possible treatments. Finally, the respondents were asked about the likely result for the individual in the vignette if she did or did not receive professional help that the respondent rated as the most appropriate.

Attitudes towards mentally ill persons were assessed by the Attitudes to Mental Illness Questionnaire (AMI) of the UK Department of Health. The AMI was originally developed in 1993 but the questions used in this study were from 2011 and 2014 [9]. The AMI includes 26 items from the 40-item Community Attitudes toward the Mentally Ill scale (CAMI) and an added item on employment-related attitudes [10]. The items explore attitudes related to fear and exclusion of people with mental disorder, understanding and tolerance of mental disorder, and integration of people into the community. The participants rated the 27 statements on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “1 = strongly disagree” to “5 = strongly agree” [9, 11]. The AMI is validated in various languages and has been used in studies conducted in Sweden, China, and Spain [12, 13, 14].

RESULTS

Previous contact with a person with mental illness

To understand the previous experience and relationships participants have had with a person with a mental illness, a descriptive statistic was performed. The results indicated that 6.7% of the participants are living or have lived with a person with mental illness, 34.9% have or had a neighbor, 12.7% have or had a coworker, and 12.1% reported having a close friend with mental illness.

Furthermore, the results showed that 34.3% of the participants had a family member or a close friend with problems similar to those described in the vignette. The responses showed that 13.9% of the respondents had personally experienced some of the problems described in

Table 1. Distribution of the participants based on their age and sex

| Parameter | Age range (years) | Total |
|-----------|-------------------|-------|
|            | 17–19             | 20–39 | 40–59 | 60–80 |       |
| Sex        |                   |       |       |       |       |
| Male       | Count             | 23    | 161   | 45    | 3     | 232   |
|           | Within sex        | 9.9   | 69.4  | 19.4  | 1.3   | 100%  |
|           | Within age range  | 50    | 46.9  | 42.9  | 30    | 46.0% |
| Female     | Count             | 23    | 182   | 60    | 7     | 272   |
|           | Within sex        | 8.5   | 66.9  | 22.1  | 2.6   | 100%  |
|           | within age range  | 50    | 53.1  | 57.1  | 70    | 54%   |
| Total      |                   | 46    | 343   | 105   | 10    | 504   |
|            | Within sex        | 9.1   | 68.1  | 20.8  | 2     | 100%  |
|            | Within age range  | 100   | 100   | 100   | 100   | 100%  |
| Median     |                   |       |       |       |       | 25    |
| Mean       |                   |       |       |       |       | 30.59 |
| SD         |                   |       |       |       |       | 12.23 |
the vignette and 5.8% received treatments for these symptoms. A total of 0.8% of the participants self-reported that they have a mental illness diagnosis, while 3.2% reported that they were taking antidepressants at the time of the interview. Further analysis revealed that two out of 16 participants who self-reported antidepressant consumption disclosed a diagnosis of depression, while 14 participants did not report a mental illness diagnosis. A total of 56% of the participants who self-reported consumption of antidepressants were less than 40 years old.

**Recognition of disorder, beliefs about causes, first aid, treatment, and outcomes**

The responses to the question, “What, if anything, is wrong with Maria?” are summarized in Table 2, which shows that 72.8% of the sample identified a mental health issue, while 41% of the sample correctly recognized MDD.

As shown in Table 3, most of the participants (82%) believed that stressful life events caused the person's problems, while 6.9% of the sample thought it is due to biological factors.

For the question, “How could Maria best be helped?”, 42.5% of the participants rated professional help as the most important support, and 12% of the participants rated conversation with family or friends as important (Table 4).

**Table 2. Assessment of the problems described in the vignette**

| Problem                                      | %  |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| MDD                                          | 40.9 |
| Psychological problems                       | 21.8 |
| Psychological problems / MDD                 | 10.1 |
| I do not know                                | 7.7 |
| Problems related to work                     | 6.0 |
| Something else (including health problems, e.g. cancer) | 3.6 |
| Multiple causes                             | 10.1 |

MDD – major depressive disorder

**Table 3. Percentage of the participants’ rating of the causes of the person's behavior**

| Perceived cause                                      | %  |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Stressful life events                                | 81.7 |
| Stressful life events and biological factors         | 10.3 |
| Biological factors                                   | 6.9 |
| Magic, evil spirits                                  | 4  |
| Missing data                                         | 6  |

**Table 4. Participants’ ratings of the help which the person in the vignette needs**

| Type of help                                      | %  |
|---------------------------------------------------|----|
| Counseling or psychotherapy                       | 23.8 |
| Help from a psychologist                          | 18.7 |
| Conversation with family or friends about current problems | 12.3 |
| Engagement in some other activity (e.g. taking a summer vacation or some other pleasant activity) | 6  |
| Taking a medication                               | 2.2 |
| Help from a primary physician                     | 1.6 |
| Multiple sources of help                           | 35.4 |

The respondents were asked to rate whether different types of help would be helpful or harmful. (Table 5). Most of the respondents regarded support from a psychologist as helpful, followed by help from a friend or a family member and a psychiatrist.

The respondents were given a list of various treatments to rate as helpful or harmful. Table 6 shows that the consumption of vitamins or/and minerals was rated the most helpful, followed by antidepressants, and healing herbs and tea.

The results of the participants’ opinion on the person's prognosis with and without the help they thought was the most appropriate are presented in Table 7. Most of the participants believed that the person in the vignette could completely recover with adequate help, and 55.6% of the sample responded that the condition would deteriorate without adequate help and treatment.

**Attitudes to mental illness**

Following Rüsch et al. [11] study results of the explanatory analysis of AMI, two mean composite scores were calculated. In their study, two factors were extracted – “prejudice and exclusion” and “tolerance and support for community care.” The average factor score for prejudice and exclusion subscale in the present study was 2.4 (SD = 0.58), while the score for tolerance and support for community care subscale was 3.72 (SD = 0.52). In addition, the mean composite score for AMI was computed as in other studies and the result was 3.54 (SD = 0.47) [15, 16]. The Cronbach α for the prejudice and exclusion subscale was 0.77 (a total of 14 items), while the Cronbach α for the tolerance and support for community care subscale was 0.72 (a total of 13 items). Both subscales were negatively correlated (r = -0.51). For the AMI composite score, the Cronbach α was 0.82.

To provide an easier interpretation, the reverse items within the prejudice and exclusion subscale and the tolerance and support for community care subscale were re-coded in the direction so that higher scores indicated more prejudice and exclusion, or tolerance and support. In addition, in the second step, all negative items were re-coded so that a higher composite score of the AMI scale presented more positive attitudes.

In addition, 2 (sex) × 4 (level of education) univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the AMI scores revealed the main effect of education (F(1.496) = 4.085, p < 0.01, partial eta-squared (η²) = 0.024). The post hoc Scheffé's test showed that the participants who had finished middle school (eight years of education) held the most negative attitudes (M = 3.23, SD = 0.63) among all four groups; p = 0.044, M = 3.52, SD = 0.47 were the results for the participants with a high school diploma; p = 0.011, M = 3.58, SD = 0.42 were the results for the participants with a bachelor's degree, and p = 0.019, M = 3.68, SD = 0.47 for the participants with a master's or doctoral degree. No main effect of sex or an interaction was found.

Furthermore, 2 (sex) × 4 (level of education) ANOVA on tolerance and support for community care subscale showed a main effect of education (F(1.496) = 3.914,
p < 0.01, η² = 0.023). Post hoc Scheffé’s test showed that participants who finished middle school (eight years of education) held the most negative attitudes (M = 3.37, SD = 0.78) compared to participants with high school diploma (p = 0.040, M = 3.71, SD = 0.52) and with a bachelor’s degree (p = 0.009, M = 3.78, SD = 0.48). No main effect of the sex or effect of interaction was established. Furthermore, no main effect of sex, age, or their interaction on the prejudice and exclusion scale was found.

Pearson’s correlation between age and prejudice and the exclusion scale was significant (r = 0.124, p < 0.01). The results indicated that with increasing age, the participants held more negative attitudes on the prejudice and exclusion subscale. No correlations between age and the AMI composite score or the tolerance and support for community care scale were found.

**DISCUSSION**

The present study examined the mental health literacy and attitudes in relation to MDD among a sample of the general population in Serbia. The results showed that 34.3% of the respondents reported that someone in their family or a close friend had problems similar to the one presented in the vignette and 13.9% of the respondents had personally experienced them. In the research by Reavley and Jorm [8], almost two-thirds of respondents revealed that a family member or a close friend had experienced similar problems, and 33% stated they had a personal experience similar to those presented in the vignette. The difference between the study by Reavley and Jorm [8] and the present study could be contributed to campaigns about mental health that had been active in Australia for over 15 years. Research indicated that in areas where there had been active campaigns to improve mental health literacy, a greater number of people identified themselves or family members to have MDD [8].

Although 13.9% of the respondents in the current study self-reported experience with problems similar to the ones presented in the vignette, only 3.2% reported taking antidepressants. This result is in accordance with an analysis in Serbia which showed that the use of antidepressants is low compared to the number of people with MDD [17]. Interestingly, only two out of 16 respondents who reported taking antidepressants disclosed the diagnosis of depression. Evidence suggests that people with mental health problems often fear stigma and this may influence help-seeking behavior or adherence to treatment [18]. In the present study, a definition of antidepressants was not provided, which could have left space for its different interpretation by the respondents (such as using over-the-counter medication). Further research is warranted to examine whether this discrepancy is evident among a larger sample of people who consume antidepressants and what factors could contribute to it.

Knowing that early recognition and early treatment are positively related to the long-term outcome of a disorder,
the importance of recognizing mental health disorders at an early stage is a clear indication for seeking professional help [19]. Although recognition of a mental health problem was high in the present sample, only 40% of the participants correctly recognized MDD, which is considerably lower compared with the 86% recognition in a study conducted in Australia [20]. Recognition of the disorder in the present sample was at the same level as that in Australia 21 years ago [21]. That an active campaign is effective is evident in the study in which Jorm and associates showed improvement in depression recognition from 39% to 67% in the span of 8 years (1995 to 2003) [21].

The respondents in the present study believed that stress contributed more to the development of MDD than biological factors. This is in agreement with the findings that the general public favors psychosocial explanations over biological explanations for different mental health disorders, including depression [22].

When respondents were asked about the helpfulness of various people, psychologists were highly rated, followed by friends and psychiatrists. The slightly lower rating of help from a psychiatrist could be due to the less severe symptoms presented by the person in the vignette. On the other hand, studies in Australia showed that a general practitioner (GP) would be recommended first, followed by a counselor and a family member [7, 8]. The difference among these results could be explained by the different organization of the health system in Serbia and Australia. In Serbia, people who experience symptoms of mental illness are under the primary care of a psychiatrist, bypassing services provided by a GP. It is notably that in Serbia, only 39% of the patients who are treated by a psychiatrist initially visited a general practitioner [23]. Directing patients towards a GP could lead to early recognition of mental disorder and adequate treatment. The importance of social support to persons with mental disorders was shown in an earlier study in the USA [24], and the resent sample confirmed that help from friends was also highly rated in Serbia.

Ratings given for the helpfulness of various treatments are not consistent with the evidence of controlled trials, which have indicated that both antidepressants and psychotherapy are effective treatments for depression [25]. Respondents rated vitamins and healing herbs as the most helpful kind of the treatment. It seems that the general public prefer non-standard treatments over conventional medicine [26], suggesting that public do not share professionals’ opinions about the efficacy of psychiatric treatment. Antidepressants were rated by 41% as helpful and by one-third as harmful treatment. This ambivalence indicates that the general population has different opinions on their effects. Jorm and associates showed that the belief in the effectiveness of antidepressants increased between 1997 [7] to 2011 [8] attributing the change to public education programs. Negative beliefs towards medications were present in the Serbian sample, which is consistent with results from Australia [8].

The findings of the present study show that the public clearly sees the condition described in the vignette as treatable. The predominant belief that mental disorders are treatable has also been found in different studies [27, 28]. Research in Australia also showed optimism about the prospect for recovery with adequate help [7, 8].

Using AMI, it was noted that the public held moderately positive attitudes towards people with mental health disorders. However, it was indicated that with increasing age, the participants had more negative attitudes on the prejudice and exclusion subscale, which is in line with other research [29, 30]. One explanation could be that older people lived in the era of institutionalization of people with mental disorders in Serbia and hence, they had less contact with them, which might have contributed to their belief that people with mental disorders should be placed in an institution. Participants who had lower level of education held the most negative attitudes on the tolerance and support for community care subscale and the overall AMI score. Different studies suggest that individuals with higher level of education had more access to health information, better understanding of such information and greater knowledge of mental disorders [30].

Limitations of the study is that it included a convenient sample consisting mostly of young adults and the diagnostic vignette approach was used, which does not allow the entire domain of that which constitutes mental health literacy to be evaluated.

CONCLUSION

Although recognition of mental health problems in the sample was high, 41% of the participants recognized MDD based on the symptoms in the vignette. Moreover, the effectiveness of antidepressants was recognized by less than half of the sample. Furthermore, most of the participants thought that the only cause of the problems presented in the vignette was due to stressful life events. Strength in mental health literacy was seen in the rating of professional help as the most helpful, as well as the belief that the actor in the vignette could improve with adequate help. This was a pilot study on mental health literacy in Serbia that could help in the design of new research studies with focus on different variables that could contribute to mental health knowledge. In addition, the findings could help in the design of education programs to enhance knowledge about the common mental disorders, teach help-seeking skills, and mental health literacy. In the longer term, enhanced mental health literacy may be expected to result in early recognition of mental disorders and higher rates of help-seeking behavior.
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САЖЕТАК
Увод/Циљ Студије је испитати писменост у области менталног здравља код узора основе опште популације у Србији, као и ставове према особама са менталним болестима. Методе Примењена је студија попречног пресека, са структурираним интервјуом и вињетом која приказује особу са симптомима депресије. Резултати Резултати су указали да је 72% испитивача пре- познало да је у питању неки проблем менталног здравља, док је 40,9% тачно идентификовало особу са депресивним поремећајем. Више испитивача је веровало да је депресија узрокована стресом него биолошким факторима. Како најко- риснији помоћ за особу приказану у вињети је био витаминизовани и лековити биљак. Закључак Писменост у области менталног здравља у Србији је умерено позитивна. Ставови према особама са менталним болестима су умерено позитивни. Кључне речи: писменост у области менталног здравља; депресија; ставови према особама са менталним болестима
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