



SYMPOSIUM

Where Visionaries Converge

WHO DEFENDS THE MIND?

White Paper Series

**Paper 5 — Strong Families, Strong Minds
Building a Connected Family–Mental Health
Ecosystem for India**

WHO DEFENDS THE MIND?

White Paper Series

Paper 5 - Strong Families, Strong Minds

**Building a Connected Family–Mental Health Ecosystem
for India**

SYMPOSIUM

SYMPOSIUM

WHO DEFENDS THE MIND?

WhitePaperSeries · Paper 5

Strong Families, Strong Minds: A Conversation Between Spirituality and Science

*Presented By:
Symposium
Hyderabad*

*Supported by:
Indian Institute of
Information Technology (IIIT
Hyderabad)*

A white paper derived from
Symposium 5th Edition · Hyderabad · 19 August 2026

symposium.org.in

Contents

Executive Summary	4
PART I : THE QUESTION	7
PART II: WHAT THE EVIDENCE TELLS US	9
PART III: THE CONNECTED FAMILY–MENTAL HEALTH ECOSYSTEM.....	13
PART IV: THE HUMAN SKILLS-LEARNINGS FROM METAPHORS	16
PART V: FROM PRINCIPLE TO ACTION	19
PART VI — FROM ACTION TO IMPLEMENTATION.....	25
PART VII — HOW WILL WE KNOW?.....	27
PART VIII — A FAMILY PRACTICE GUIDE.....	29
CONCLUSION — WHO DEFENDS THE MIND?	30
ANNEX 1 — CLAIMS THIS WHITE PAPER DELIBERATELY DOES NOT MAKE.....	34
ANNEX 2 — METHODOLOGY	35

A quieter question

A conversation about mental health often begins with the individual. We ask whether a person is coping, whether they are resilient, whether they should seek help, and what treatment might be appropriate. Those questions matter. But they are not the whole story.

People live in relationships. Children grow within families and communities. Young adults negotiate independence while remaining connected to parents and peers. Adults balance partnership, employment, parenting and caregiving. Older people experience ageing within networks of family, friends, neighbours and services. The mind is personal, but the conditions in which a person has to live are not.

That was the human starting point of the Symposium conversation on Strong Families, Strong Minds. Again and again, the dialogue returned to ordinary things: being heard; having a place where one can speak; learning how to communicate; understanding another generation; allowing a child to develop without withdrawing love; accepting that failure can be part of growth; and knowing when a difficulty has crossed the threshold at which professional help is needed.

The spiritual perspective presented in the dialogue gave these ideas memorable language. The clinical perspective brought caution, context and the reminder that not every problem can be held safely inside a family. This white paper takes both seriously without confusing either with scientific evidence.

The evidence tells a similarly nuanced story. Family relationships can be associated with mental-health outcomes. Social connection extends beyond the household. Parenting interventions can be taught. Caregivers can become overloaded. Poverty and household conditions matter. Gendered power and violence can make family environments unsafe. Schools and communities can become bridges to care. Primary care, tele-mental-health, specialist services and rehabilitation remain essential.

The question, then, is larger than whether families are strong. It is whether people are surrounded by enough healthy relationships, informed caregivers, responsive institutions and accessible services to meet the difficulties of life at the right level.

The proposition of this paper is deliberately practical: India does not need to choose between family support and professional mental-health care. It needs an ecosystem in which healthy relationships, informed families, connected communities, supportive institutions and accessible mental-health services reinforce one another.

Executive Summary

India's mental-health challenge cannot be reduced to an individual failure to cope. The National Mental Health Survey of India 2015–16 documented substantial mental morbidity and a very large treatment gap (National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences [NIMHANS], 2016).

The evidence supports taking relationships seriously, but it does not support romanticising family structure. A systematic review and meta-analysis found a negative association between family cohesion and depression (Bian et al., 2024). This is evidence about relational quality. It is not evidence that joint households are inherently healthier than nuclear households, or that household structure determines mental health.

The parenting evidence is more actionable. WHO guidance recommends evidence-based parenting interventions for caregivers of children aged 0–17 years to reduce maltreatment and harsh parenting and to strengthen parent–child relationships. Parenting support can therefore be treated as a learnable public-health and developmental resource rather than an informal skill that families are simply expected to acquire.

Indian evidence also shows why the family cannot be treated as an isolated unit. In rural Central India, Gautam et al. (2025) found that parents commonly identified poverty and family conflict among perceived causes of children's mental-health problems, while only a small proportion reported seeking mental-health services. A systematic review of adolescent help-seeking found stigma, low mental-health literacy, confidentiality concerns, provider experiences and socioeconomic constraints among important barriers; supportive families and peers, counsellor relationships and psychoeducation were among the facilitators (Kallakuri et al., 2026).

The family can also be a site of harm. Reported childhood exposure to interparental violence was associated with several adult behavioural and relationship indicators in a nationally representative Indian analysis, although the cross-sectional design limits causal interpretation (Pradhan & Pratik, 2025). Research on women's agency similarly shows how family and cultural expectations can constrain autonomy and generate emotional labour (D'Souza & Kapoor, 2024). A family-strengthening agenda that does not include safety, autonomy and protection from coercion is therefore incomplete.

Material conditions matter as well. Indian studies in this evidence base connect mental-health experiences with poverty, household resources, caregiving demands and socioeconomic disadvantage. These findings do not mean that poverty mechanically causes a particular disorder. They mean that families operate within conditions that can expand or restrict the choices available to them.

Community and health-system evidence points toward connection rather than substitution. Community health workers in an Indian programme used contextual knowledge, trusting relationships and locally adapted strategies to address social dimensions of mental health (Jain et al., 2024). Reviews of Indian mental-health programmes identify persistent implementation challenges around workforce, access, coordination, financing and monitoring. Rehabilitation literature and the Mental Healthcare Act framework further emphasise community living, functioning, family participation and continuity of care.

This paper therefore proposes a Connected Family–Mental Health Ecosystem Framework with six interacting levels: the individual; relationships; family; community; institutions; and mental-health services. Around these levels sit economic security, education, housing, gender equity, social protection, safety, human rights and equity. Eleven cross-cutting dimensions run through the framework: belonging, psychological safety, communication, emotional literacy, autonomy, boundaries, repair, caregiving support, help-seeking, continuity of care, and safety from violence, coercion and abuse.

The framework is a conceptual synthesis grounded in dialogue and scientific resources. However, it is not a validated clinical instrument and is not presented as an empirically validated model.

The practical message is simple but not simplistic: strengthen relationships; teach families what can be taught; make schools and communities better connectors; support caregivers; improve routes into care; retain professional responsibility for assessment and treatment; protect people when family environments are unsafe; and measure whether these changes actually improve people's lives.

How this white paper uses evidence

This is a white paper, not a systematic review, thesis chapter or catalogue of research papers. It utilizes scientific papers form an evidence base that tests, deepens and qualifies the ideas raised in the Symposium dialogue.

Four kinds of material are kept distinct:

Evidence-supported: findings that can be traced to credible empirical research, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, national surveys, official policy documents or authoritative guidance.

Symposium-derived: themes, metaphors, questions and observations arising from the symposium dialogue.

Interpretation: the synthesis made by the authors of white paper when evidence and dialogue are brought into conversation.

Proposed policy direction: an actions suggested by the authors. It is not described as proven simply because it is plausible.

This distinction is not a technicality. A story can illuminate a problem without establishing prevalence. A memorable metaphor can help a family think differently without being a validated intervention. A policy proposal can be sensible without yet having evidence of population-level effectiveness. Keeping those distinctions visible is what allows a public white paper to remain both human and scientifically responsible.

PART I : THE QUESTION

Who defends the mind?

The question sounds almost too large. Yet it becomes concrete when a child stops speaking at dinner, when a young adult begins withdrawing from friends, when a parent is overwhelmed by caregiving, when a couple cannot recover from repeated conflict, or when someone has been carrying distress quietly for months.

Who notices? Who listens? Who knows what to do? Who knows what not to do? Who can help the family? Who can help the person? And who takes responsibility when the family itself is the source of danger?

The answer cannot be one household, one profession or one institution.

A person encounters different forms of support across the life course. A family member may notice a change first. A friend may hear what cannot yet be said at home. A teacher may see a child differently from a parent. A community worker may help someone navigate a service. Primary care may become the first formal point of contact. A mental-health professional may assess and treat. Rehabilitation may help a person return to education, employment, relationships and community life.

The idea of a 'village' is useful here not because there was once one perfect village that modern India has lost, but because psychological support is distributed. Sometimes the village is physical. Sometimes it is a phone call from a grandparent in another city, a trusted teacher, a peer group, a neighbour, a counsellor, a self-help group, a workplace or a health service.

The task is therefore not to restore an imagined past. It is to make sure that people do not lose the functions of connection simply because the form of family life has changed.

Strong families or strong relationships?

The phrase 'strong families, strong minds' carries an important intuition, but it can become misleading if strength is equated with household structure, obedience or emotional toughness.

A strong family is not a family that never argues. It is a relationship system capable of connection and disagreement, warmth and boundaries, dependence and growing autonomy, rupture and repair. It can recognise distress without turning every difficulty into illness. It can recognise illness without turning it into weakness.

Likewise, a strong mind is not a mind that never cries, never becomes overwhelmed and never needs help. Psychological strength can include recognising vulnerability, tolerating difficult emotions, using relationships wisely, asking for help, adapting and returning to meaningful activity when possible.

This matters because the opposite of vulnerability is not necessarily strength. Sometimes it is silence. Sometimes it is fear. Sometimes it is the learned belief that needing another person is failure.

The evidence base reinforces this broader definition. Social connection has become an explicit global public-health concern, and the WHO Commission on Social Connection frames connection in terms of the structure, ***function and quality of relationships*** rather than simply whether a person belongs to a household (World Health Organization Commission on Social Connection, 2025).

PART II: WHAT THE EVIDENCE TELLS US

The social life of mental health

Mental health is not only a private psychological state. It is lived through relationships, opportunities, institutions and material conditions. The WHO Commission on Social Connection identifies loneliness and social isolation as widespread concerns with implications for health and wellbeing and argues for action across sectors (World Health Organization Commission on Social Connection, 2025).

India's own mental-health service history makes the point from another direction. The National Mental Health Survey 2015–16 documented a large gap between mental-health needs and treatment. That gap cannot be closed by asking families simply to become more capable. A family cannot provide a service that does not exist, and a person cannot use a service that is inaccessible, unaffordable, unacceptable or difficult to navigate.

The more useful policy question is therefore one of pathways. How does distress move from being invisible to being noticed? How does noticing become conversation? How does conversation become help-seeking? How does help-seeking become assessment? How does treatment become recovery and participation? Every broken link in that chain matters.

The family as a relational environment

The strongest family argument in this paper is not that families are always protective. It is that relationship quality matters.

Bian et al. (2024), in a systematic review and meta-analysis of 71 studies involving more than 90,000 participants, found a negative association between family cohesion and depression. The association varied across contexts and study characteristics. The appropriate conclusion is therefore modest but meaningful: relational cohesion is relevant to mental health, while family structure itself should not be treated as destiny.

The practical dimensions are familiar: belonging, emotional availability, communication, respect, reliability and the ability to remain connected through disagreement. These are not magic ingredients. They are relational conditions that can make it easier for people to disclose difficulties and remain connected.

At the same time, cohesion without boundaries can become over-involvement. Closeness without autonomy can become control. Responsibility without respite can become burden. Family support must therefore be understood as adaptive rather than simply intense.

When the family becomes a source of distress

A white paper about family and mental health has to say something difficult plainly: kinship does not guarantee safety. Pradhan and Pratik (2025), using nationally representative NFHS-5 data

from 42,059 men aged 15–54 years, found associations between reported childhood exposure to interparental violence and several adult behavioural and relationship indicators among men. D’Souza and Kapoor (2024) provide another reminder to this fact that sometimes families can be source of distress too.

The implication is not that families are dangerous institutions. It is that family policy must include safeguarding. Where there is violence, coercion or abuse, the answer cannot be better communication alone. The system must protect the person at risk.

Growing up: childhood, adolescence and emerging adulthood

Childhood and adolescence make the limits of a family-only model particularly visible. Children often depend on adults to recognise changes that they may not have the language or confidence to explain.

A systematic review of Indian school children and adolescents identified mental-health concerns across a broad range of studies, including depression, anxiety, psychological distress and behavioural and social difficulties (Balamurugan et al., 2024). The review should not be used to produce a single national prevalence estimate because the included studies differed in setting and method.

Mahanta et al. (2026) describe a multi-tiered school mental-health landscape, while also identifying implementation gaps involving workforce, funding, stigma, parental apprehension, teacher preparedness and evaluation. Deb and Deb (2025) argue for school-based family counselling and stronger family–school collaboration, but explicitly point toward the need for research on effectiveness and scalability.

The most useful lesson is not that schools should become clinics. It is that schools can become connectors. They can create psychological safety, identify concerns within their scope, engage parents appropriately and connect students to trained professionals.

Kallakuri et al. (2026), in a systematic review, identified stigma and low mental-health literacy as central barriers, alongside confidentiality concerns, academic pressures, socioeconomic constraints and negative healthcare experiences.

A mental-health ecosystem for young people must therefore protect both connection and privacy. A family should be a source of support, but an adolescent also needs a trustworthy route to speak when the family is not the first or safest place to begin.

The conditions around the family

Families do not operate in a vacuum.

Singh et al. (2024) examined psychological distress among low-income and economically marginalised populations in India and identified socioeconomic and social conditions as relevant risk and protective factors.

Ganie et al. (2026), studying 120 children with severe mental illness in a South Indian tertiary-care setting, found differences in psychosocial functioning associated with socioeconomic status, family income and source of income.

Gorla et al. (2026) add household-level evidence from a large rural and urban Indian sample, examining associations between household living conditions and mental health.

The same principle applies to caregiving. The Indian scoping review of dementia caregiving found recurring experiences of burden, stress, poor health, inadequate support, insufficient respite and lack of information (Lillekroken et al., 2024). Saikia et al. (2026) similarly identified awareness, denial, expressed emotion, community support and health-system barriers among caregivers of children with congenital anomalies in urban slums.

If families are expected to participate in mental-health care, the system has to recognise the family as a unit that can itself require information, respite, support and care.

Community: the bridge between relationship and system

Jain et al. (2024) offer one of the most useful pieces of evidence for the ecosystem model. In a qualitative study of community mental-health workers in North India, workers described how local knowledge, trust, relationships and understanding of social and economic context shaped the way they supported people with psychosocial disabilities.

The significance is not that a community worker can do the work of a psychiatrist or clinical psychologist. The significance is that proximity creates a different kind of capability. A trained community worker may notice context, reduce practical barriers, support engagement and connect people with formal services.

That capability requires boundaries. Task-sharing is not task-abandonment. If non-specialists are used, they need defined roles, training, supervision, referral pathways, escalation procedures and mechanisms for quality assurance.

The community therefore belongs between the household and the health system—not as a replacement for either, but as a bridge.

Families as partners in recovery

Recovery does not end when symptoms reduce.

The Indian Family Fellowship Society experience described by Ezhumalai and Ranganathan shows a family-led self-help movement that combined family participation with professional technical support, psychosocial rehabilitation, family education, vocational activity, supported

employment, home care and referral/continuity. It is a historical service case rather than a controlled efficacy study, but it illustrates an important principle: families can be co-producers of recovery without becoming substitutes for clinical expertise.

Roy and Angothu (2026), analysing the implications of India's Mental Healthcare Act 2017, similarly place rehabilitation, community living, family and stakeholder involvement within the broader conception of mental healthcare. The policy architecture points toward functioning, participation and community life, not only symptom management.

The distinction is important. A person receiving professional treatment may still need a family to accompany them, a community to welcome them, an employer to accommodate them and a rehabilitation service to support return to meaningful activity. Clinical care and relational support are not competing categories.

What the evidence now allows us to say

- Relationship quality matters to mental health; family structure alone is not a sufficient policy target.
- Social connection extends beyond the household and is relevant to public health.
- Parenting practices can be taught and supported through evidence-based programmes.
- Families can contribute to recognition, disclosure, help-seeking, treatment engagement and recovery.
- Family environments can also contain violence, coercion, stigma, conflict or excessive burden; safeguarding is therefore essential.
- Children and adolescents need connected adults and accessible, trustworthy routes to professional support.
- Community workers and other non-specialists can have useful bridging roles when training, supervision and scope are clear.
- Material and socioeconomic conditions shape the environment in which families attempt to support mental health.
- Rehabilitation and community participation are part of a complete mental-health response.
- The effectiveness of the proposed ecosystem itself must be evaluated rather than assumed.

The evidence does not allow this paper to claim that one family structure is universally healthiest, that family support can resolve most mental-health conditions, or that a single communication or relationship practice is a proven treatment for mental illness.

PART III: THE CONNECTED FAMILY–MENTAL HEALTH ECOSYSTEM

A framework for thinking beyond the household

The framework proposed here begins with a simple observation: the person does not encounter mental health policy as an abstract system. They encounter people and places.

The individual meets relationships. Relationships sit inside families. Families are connected to communities and institutions. Institutions connect, sometimes imperfectly, with primary care and mental-health services. Around all of them sit the conditions that determine what choices are realistically available.

Level	Core function	Examples
1. Individual	Experience, coping, agency, functioning	Emotional awareness; coping; decision-making; help-seeking
2. Relationships	Connection and interpersonal support	Partners; siblings; friends; peers; trusted adults
3. Family	Belonging, everyday care, recognition and continuity	Parents; children; grandparents; caregivers; chosen family
4. Community	Proximity, social connection and navigation	Peer groups; NGOs; self-help groups; community workers; social organisations
5. Institutions	Prevention, psychological safety and access points	Schools; colleges; workplaces; primary care; public services
6. Mental-health services	Assessment, treatment, rehabilitation and continuity	Counsellors; clinical psychologists; psychiatrists; multidisciplinary services; Tele-MANAS; rehabilitation

Surrounding the six levels are economic security, education, housing, gender equity, social protection, safety, human rights and equity. These are not optional background variables. They can determine whether a family has time to listen, whether a caregiver can take someone to an appointment, whether a woman can safely exercise autonomy, whether a young person can continue education, and whether treatment is realistically accessible.

Eleven dimensions run through the ecosystem

- **Belonging:** the experience of mattering and being connected.

- **Psychological safety:** being able to express difficulty without expecting humiliation or threat.
- **Communication:** the ability to exchange information, emotion and disagreement with respect.
- **Emotional literacy:** recognizing and naming feelings and changes in functioning.
- **Autonomy:** allowing developmentally and contextually appropriate choice and agency.
- **Boundaries:** maintaining limits that protect dignity, privacy and relationships.
- **Repair:** responding to rupture through acknowledgement, responsibility, change and reconnection.
- **Caregiving support:** recognizing and supporting the needs of those who care for others.
- **Help-seeking:** moving from recognition of difficulty toward appropriate support.
- **Continuity of care:** reducing avoidable breaks between assessment, treatment, follow-up and rehabilitation.
- **Safety from violence, coercion and abuse:** a non-negotiable safeguard across the entire system.

This eleven-dimension framework is a conceptual proposal of the white paper. It is not a validated clinical instrument, screening tool or empirically validated model.

The family–professional care continuum

One of the most important nuances in this paper is to reject a false boundary between 'family problems' and 'mental illness'. People move across levels of need.

Situation	Appropriate layer	System response
Ordinary stress, loneliness, life transitions	Relationships / family / community	Listening, connection, practical support, problem-solving, healthy routines
Persistent or impairing difficulty	Family + community + primary care	Recognition, conversation, assessment pathway, support and referral
Likely clinical condition or significant impairment	Professional mental-health care	Assessment and evidence-based treatment; family involvement where appropriate
High-risk, severe or complex presentation	Specialist / crisis services	Urgent assessment, safety planning, specialist intervention and coordinated care
Longer-term disability or functional difficulty	Rehabilitation + family + community	Psychosocial rehabilitation, supported participation,

		vocational/social support and continuity
--	--	--

This is a service-navigation framework, not a diagnostic algorithm. Families should not be asked to diagnose. A person should not be denied professional care because a family believes the problem is 'only stress'. Conversely, not every painful experience requires a psychiatric label. The task is to create pathways that allow appropriate assessment.

Families as partners, not substitutes

The phrase 'family-centred care' can be misunderstood. It should not mean that the family becomes responsible for providing clinical treatment. It means that, with consent and appropriate safeguards, family members may be involved in understanding the person's context, supporting treatment engagement, assisting with practical care and contributing to recovery.

When the family is itself unsafe, the principle changes. The system's responsibility is to protect the person, not to preserve the appearance of family involvement. This distinction should be built into policy, training, documentation and supervision.

PART IV: THE HUMAN SKILLS-LEARNINGS FROM METAPHORS

The dialogue from symposium gave the ecosystem a human vocabulary. The following practices retain that vocabulary but do not present it as a validated treatment programme.

- **Listen to listen**

The dialogue repeatedly returned to listening. The point was not that advice is always wrong. It was that advice can arrive before understanding. A useful household practice is to create a short interval in which the person speaking does not have to defend, justify or solve their experience. Put the phone away. Give attention. Ask one clarifying question. Reflect what you heard before deciding what to do. The adolescent help-seeking literature gives this practice a wider meaning (Kallakuri et al., 2026).

Symposium-derived practice: 'listen to listen' is a useful relational heuristic. This paper does not claim that it is a validated intervention or that listening alone treats mental illness.

- **The hidden mango**

The dialogue used a simple metaphor for a familiar family problem: two people can look at the same event and see different things because each is missing part of the other's context.

We keep the metaphor because it captures something important about perspective-taking. Before interpreting behaviour, ask what information may be missing. A teenager who appears indifferent may be exhausted. A parent who appears controlling may be frightened. A partner who appears withdrawn may be overwhelmed. These are possibilities, not diagnoses.

Perspective-taking should not become an excuse for harm. Understanding why someone behaves in a particular way does not require accepting violence, coercion or humiliation.

The strongest version of empathy is therefore two-way: I try to understand your position, and you remain responsible for understanding the impact of your behavior on me. The mutual empathy cultivation therefore helps us to understand intergenerational family needs and way to resolve the conflicts.

- **The Turbulence We Cannot Eliminate**

Life includes turbulence: failure, uncertainty, conflict, illness, loss, financial pressure, changing relationships and the challenges of growing up. Families cannot eliminate these conditions. They can, however, influence whether people face them with connection or isolation.

The Symposium dialogue used the image of navigating turbulence. A skilled pilot cannot control the weather; the task is to recognize the conditions, respond appropriately and continue safely.

Families can play a similar supportive not clinical role. They can provide belonging, listening, practical help and encouragement. They can also help a person recognise when difficulty has exceeded what can reasonably be managed within the family.

This requires distinguishing **resilience from repression**. Strength does not mean enduring everything silently. Sometimes navigating turbulence means slowing down, asking for help, changing course, or seeking professional care. ***A strong family does not promise a life without turbulence. It helps ensure that a person does not have to navigate it alone.***

- **Resistance and the safe nest**

The dialogue described growth as requiring both resistance and a place to return to. Growing up requires both **challenge and security**. That idea can be translated into a *developmental principle: children and young adults need opportunities to encounter manageable difficulty while retaining reliable relationships.*

A supportive family does not remove every disappointment. It can allow age-appropriate responsibility, tolerate mistakes and encourage problem-solving. But it also communicates that failure does not mean loss of belonging.

The balance matters. Too little challenge can limit opportunities to practise coping. Too much pressure, especially when combined with humiliation or fear, can become harmful. The aim is not to engineer adversity. It is to avoid turning ordinary difficulty into either catastrophe or shame. D'Souza and Kapoor's (2024) qualitative work with urban Indian women reminds us that family expectations and wider gendered structures can constrain agency.

- **The emotional bank account**

The dialogue used the image of emotional deposits: attention, appreciation, affection, reliability and other small acts that build relational credit over time.

The metaphor is useful as a household reminder. ***Relationships are maintained through repeated ordinary experiences, not only through dramatic conversations after a crisis.***

But the white paper deliberately removes the numerical claims sometimes attached to this metaphor. There is no basis here for presenting a particular positive-to-negative interaction ratio as a universal clinical rule. Nor should the metaphor be equated with a validated treatment.

A practical question is enough: what are the ordinary experiences through which this relationship communicates, 'You matter here'?

- **Build the bridge before the river rises**

Another dialogue theme was preparation before crisis. The evidence supports a systems version of this idea.

Families should know where to turn before a crisis occurs. Schools should know referral routes before a student needs them. Primary-care teams should know whom to contact. Tele-mental-health services should be linked to onward care. Community workers should know their scope and escalation pathways. Mental-health services should know how families and community partners can participate appropriately.

Preparedness is not prediction. It is reducing the number of decisions people have to invent when they are already distressed.

PART V: FROM PRINCIPLE TO ACTION

A connected family–mental health ecosystem becomes meaningful only when it changes what people and institutions are able to do.

A white paper becomes useful when it moves beyond agreement and asks harder questions: Who does what? Under what conditions? With what boundaries? And how will we know whether it helped?

The answer proposed here is deliberately different from asking families to become the mental-health system. The practical task is to strengthen the capabilities of families while connecting them to communities, institutions and professional services.

The proposals in this section are therefore not presented as a single proven intervention package. They constitute an evidence-informed action agenda derived from the Symposium dialogue, informed by available Indian and international evidence, and intended to be tested, evaluated and refined.

Support should become easier to find, safer to receive and more continuous across the places where people actually live their lives.

1. Build relational capabilities families can learn

Families are often expected to know how to communicate, parent, respond to distress, set boundaries and support development. Yet parenting and caregiving are developmental tasks, and good intentions do not automatically produce effective practice.

WHO guidelines identify evidence-based parenting interventions as a means of reducing child maltreatment and harsh parenting, strengthening parent–child relationships, and preventing or reducing poor parent mental health and child emotional and behavioural problems (World Health Organization [WHO], 2023). The WHO implementation handbook also emphasises structured selection, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of such interventions (WHO, 2024).

Indian evidence also suggests that recognition of childhood mental-health difficulties is uneven. In a rural Central Indian study, parents were more likely to recognise externalising difficulties than internalising problems, while reported use of mental-health services was low (Gautam et al., 2025). This was a local observational study and should not be treated as a national estimate.

Action should therefore focus on making evidence-based relational skills accessible through health, education and community settings. These programmes should support communication,

emotional responsiveness, developmentally appropriate boundaries, non-violent discipline, recognition of distress, safeguarding, and guidance on when professional assessment is needed.

Families should be supported to recognise concerns, not to diagnose or treat clinical disorders. The objective is not perfect parenting. It is to make informed, responsive and safer parenting more achievable.

2. Make listening and recognition the first bridge to help

The Symposium dialogue repeatedly returned to a simple relational idea: people sometimes need to be heard before they are advised. That idea can be translated into a practical heuristic:

Notice → Listen → Understand → Respond → Connect

This is a relational heuristic, not a validated clinical intervention. Listening is not psychotherapy, and recognition is not diagnosis. Its purpose is to improve the quality of the first response when someone shows signs of distress or asks for help.

Research on adolescents seeking mental-health care in India identifies stigma, limited mental-health literacy, concerns about confidentiality, academic and socioeconomic barriers, and negative experiences with providers as barriers. Supportive peers and families, positive counsellor relationships, psychoeducation and trained lay counsellors can facilitate help-seeking (Kallakuri et al., 2026).

Families, peers and institutions can therefore be trained to listen without immediately judging, interrogating or attempting to solve the problem. They can notice meaningful changes in functioning, clarify what kind of help is wanted, and connect the person to appropriate support. Listening should not become surveillance; confidentiality and its safeguarding limits must be explained clearly.

The purpose is not to make every family member a counsellor. It is to make the first bridge to help safer.

3. Make safety a condition of family support

Kinship does not guarantee psychological safety. A family can contain affection and conflict, belonging and exclusion, support and coercion. Where violence, abuse, neglect or intimidation is present, communication advice alone is insufficient. The system must protect the person.

Family-level action should therefore include explicit safeguards against physical punishment, humiliation or degradation, threats and intimidation, domestic or interparental violence, abuse and neglect, coercive control, and discriminatory practices that compromise safety or dignity.

The evidence base must be kept within its proper scope. Evidence on school corporal punishment should not be presented as evidence for every form of family discipline. At the same time, WHO parenting guidance supports prevention of maltreatment and harsh parenting (WHO, 2023).

Family involvement in mental-health care should be based on the person's needs, preferences and safety, rather than assumed entitlement. When family involvement itself creates risk, safeguarding takes precedence.

4. Build a connected pathway for children and adolescents

Children and adolescents often depend on adults and institutions to access support. Schools and colleges therefore have an important role, but they do not need to become clinics.

Indian reviews describe substantial heterogeneity in school mental-health findings and persistent implementation gaps, including workforce, funding, stigma and evaluation challenges (Mahanta et al., 2026). A separate systematic review of adolescent help-seeking in India highlights the importance of privacy, trust, supportive relationships and clear access pathways (Kallakuri et al., 2026).

A practical pathway is:

Mental-health literacy → trusted adult → appropriate initial response → professional assessment when indicated → referral → follow-up

Teachers and other staff can notice concerns, provide an appropriate initial response, document and communicate within defined procedures, involve parents or caregivers when appropriate, safeguard the student, and connect them to professional support. They should not be expected to diagnose mental disorders, provide specialist treatment or independently manage clinical risk.

Each school or college should have a defined pathway covering who receives a disclosure, what happens after disclosure, how confidentiality and risk are handled, when parents are involved, how professional assessment is accessed, how referrals are followed up, and what happens when a referral is not completed.

The critical question is not simply whether a school has a counsellor. It is whether a student can move safely from concern to appropriate support.

5. Rebuild the village around the family

The “village” is not an argument for returning to one preferred family structure. It is a way of describing distributed human connection around a person.

For a child, that network may include parents, grandparents, siblings, teachers, friends, neighbours, coaches, community workers and professionals. Older adults, caregivers and people living with serious mental-health conditions can also require networks that extend beyond the household.

In a Kerala study of COVID-19 survivors, social support—particularly support from friends—was associated with posttraumatic growth, whereas family support was not a significant predictor in the final model (Joy et al., 2024). The study was cross-sectional and pandemic-specific, so it does not establish a general hierarchy of relationships.

Qualitative research in North India also shows how community mental-health workers may use local knowledge, trust and contextual understanding to address social dimensions of mental health (Jain et al., 2024). This is evidence about practice and mechanisms, not proof that one community-worker model is universally effective.

The proposed role for community workers is therefore a supervised connector layer: locally credible, appropriately trained, clearly scoped, supervised, able to refer and escalate, and accountable for confidentiality, bias and access. Community workers should connect people to care, not replace professionals.

6. Stop asking families to solve problems created beyond the family

Family resilience cannot compensate indefinitely for poverty, insecure employment, inadequate housing, inaccessible healthcare, educational exclusion, discrimination, unsafe environments or gaps in disability and caregiver support.

Research among economically marginalised populations in India links psychological distress with conditions including resource scarcity, violence, gender discrimination and substance use (Singh et al., 2024). A clinic-based study of children with severe mental illness also found differences in psychosocial functioning by socioeconomic status and income-related factors (Ganie et al., 2026). A large Indian household analysis further found associations between household living conditions and depression and anxiety, with patterns differing between urban and rural settings (Gorla et al., 2026). These observational findings do not establish simple causal pathways.

The implication is not that family relationships are unimportant. It is that mental health is not produced inside relationships alone.

Action must therefore connect families to social protection, livelihood and income support, education, housing and basic services, healthcare, disability support, caregiver support, gender-equity measures, violence protection and community participation where these needs are present.

Supporting families also means supporting the conditions in which families live. The family should not be asked to compensate psychologically for structural conditions that policy has left unchanged.

7. Support the people who provide care

Care can be meaningful and exhausting at the same time. A mental-health ecosystem that asks families to provide care must also ask what happens to the people providing it.

A scoping review of dementia caregiving in India identified caregiver burden, stress, poor health, inadequate support, insufficient respite and lack of information among recurring concerns (Lillekroken et al., 2024). Research on grandmothers providing childcare in urban Indian families similarly illustrates both meaning and connection alongside reduced autonomy, leisure, social networks and belonging (Gupta et al., 2025). These findings concern specific caregiving contexts and should not be generalised to all caregivers.

The practical question is therefore: Who is providing the care, and what is the cost of that care to them?

Support may include psychoeducation, peer and support groups, respite, practical information, social-service navigation, financial or disability resources, and professional assessment when significant distress or impairment develops.

Caregiver involvement should not become an invisible extension of the health system. Caregivers are people with their own needs, rights and limits.

8. Connect families to professional care—and keep them connected through recovery

Family support and professional care should not be treated as competing models. Families may provide context, engagement and practical support, while qualified professionals remain responsible for assessment, diagnosis where applicable, treatment and clinical risk management.

The Family Fellowship Society in Bengaluru provides an illustrative Indian example of family-led psychosocial rehabilitation developed with technical support from NIMHANS, including family education, rehabilitation and continuity-oriented activities (Ezhumalai & Ranganathan, 2023/2024). This historical service review does not establish controlled treatment efficacy.

India's rights-based mental-health framework also places rehabilitation, community living and participation of families and other stakeholders within the broader mental-health system (Roy & Angothu, 2026).

A connected pathway is:

Family/community recognition → accessible entry point → assessment → appropriate referral → specialist treatment when indicated → rehabilitation/recovery support → follow-up

Family involvement should be considered rather than assumed, and should occur with attention to consent, confidentiality, safety and the person's preferences. When family involvement is unsafe, unwanted or unavailable, it must not become a barrier to care.

Families are partners in care, not substitutes for care. Continuity matters after the first contact, not only at the point of crisis.

The principle that holds the whole agenda together

Families need capabilities

Communities need connection.

Schools and colleges need pathways.

Caregivers need support.

Primary care needs capacity to recognize and connect.

Digital services need continuity beyond first contact.

Specialist services need the capacity to provide appropriate treatment and rehabilitation.

Government needs to create the conditions in which these functions can work together.

And the entire system needs safeguards against violence, coercion, exclusion and neglect.

The Symposium dialogue began with the family because that is where many ordinary experiences of belonging, conflict, care and support occur. But the evidence prevents us from stopping there. The work begins at home. It cannot end there.

PART VI — FROM ACTION TO IMPLEMENTATION

Building, testing and institutionalising the connected ecosystem

Part V identified the changes required across families, communities, schools, caregivers, professional services and the wider system. The next task is to translate these priorities into connected, testable pathways rather than another collection of disconnected programmes.

Implementation should proceed through four stages: build, pilot, adapt and institutionalise. The sequence is a proposal for disciplined learning, not a promise that every proposed intervention will work.

2026–2027 — Build the foundations

The first task is to understand and strengthen what already exists.

- Map family-support, parenting, caregiver, school, community, primary-care, Tele-MANAS and specialist pathways in selected geographies.
- Identify gaps in recognition, referral, access and continuity.
- Develop or adapt evidence-based parenting, caregiver and mental-health-literacy resources.
- Define competencies, supervision, scope of practice, safeguarding and referral responsibilities for community connectors and other frontline personnel.
- Establish clear pathways between schools, communities, primary care and professional mental-health services.
- Develop baseline measures before implementation.

This phase should answer a basic question: What exists, what is missing, and where does a person fall out of the pathway?

2028–2029 — Pilot the pathways

The next step is to test whether the proposed connections work in real settings.

Rather than evaluating isolated activities, pilots should test combinations of the ecosystem:

Family capability → recognition → trusted community or school contact → professional assessment → appropriate care → follow-up

Pilots should be conducted across different contexts so that the model is tested beyond a single urban setting.

Evaluation should examine reach, acceptability, cultural and linguistic fit, safety, referral completion, continuity, equity and relevant outcomes. The experiences of young people, families, caregivers, community workers and professionals should inform adaptation.

The purpose of a pilot is not simply to demonstrate that something can be delivered. It is to learn whether it works, for whom, under what conditions, and with what unintended effects.

2030–2032 — Adapt and scale

Evidence from implementation and evaluation should determine what moves beyond the pilot stage. Not everything that is implemented should be scaled. Scale decisions should consider effectiveness, safety, feasibility, acceptability, equity, cost and implementation fidelity.

Where evidence supports wider use, programmes can be adapted for different populations and settings while protecting essential requirements such as safeguarding, supervision, confidentiality and appropriate clinical escalation.

Workforce capacity, referral networks and continuity mechanisms should develop alongside expansion. Scaling should therefore mean evidence-informed expansion, not simple replication.

2033–2036 — Institutionalise and continuously improve

Where evidence supports continued use, effective pathways should become part of routine health, education and social systems rather than remaining dependent on temporary projects.

This requires continued workforce development and supervision, routine monitoring, attention to equity and safety, and periodic review of outcomes and unintended consequences.

Institutionalisation should not mean protecting a programme from scrutiny. It should mean making evidence-informed practice and continuous improvement part of the system itself.

The four stages should also function as a learning cycle:

Build → Pilot → Measure → Learn → Adapt → Scale → Monitor → Reassess

The 2026–2036 roadmap is therefore a proposed implementation sequence, not a prediction of outcomes. Targets should be established after baseline assessment and revised through independent evaluation.

Part V asked what needs to change. Part VI asks how those changes can be built, tested and sustained. The remaining question is whether they actually make a difference.

PART VII — HOW WILL WE KNOW?

A system should not be judged by how many workshops it conducts, calls it answers, people it trains or programmes it launches. Those are measures of activity. The more important question is whether people's lives change in meaningful ways: whether they experience greater connection, safer relationships, better access to appropriate support, and improved wellbeing and functioning.

Evaluation should therefore follow the same ecosystem proposed in this white paper.

Level	What should be examined
Individual	Wellbeing, distress, functioning and quality of life
Relationships	Social connection, perceived support and relationship quality
Family	Family functioning, caregiver burden, mental-health literacy and help-seeking
Institutions	Psychological safety, recognition and appropriate referral
Clinical services	Access, engagement, clinical outcomes and continuity
System	Availability, affordability, language accessibility, workforce and equity
Population	Connection, mental-health literacy, help-seeking and access to care

The measurement framework should also ask questions that aggregate numbers can hide: Who benefited? Who was left out? Was it safe? What unintended effects occurred? Were improvements sustained?

This is particularly important for a family-centred ecosystem. Greater family involvement may be supportive in some circumstances but inappropriate in others. Programmes must therefore

protect confidentiality, autonomy and safety, particularly where there is violence, coercion, abuse or other risks.

Evaluation should be built into implementation rather than added after a programme has been declared successful:

Baseline → Implementation monitoring → Outcome measurement → Equity analysis → Learning → Adaptation

Measures should be appropriate to the population and intervention and, where necessary, established for reliability, validity and cultural relevance in Indian settings.

The goal is not to create another reporting system that measures everything. It is to create enough meaningful measurement to answer a fundamental question:

Are people experiencing better support, safer relationships, better access to care and better lives?

That is the standard against which the connected ecosystem should continually be tested.

PART VIII — A FAMILY PRACTICE GUIDE

Eight practices for ordinary days—and clear limits for difficult ones

The purpose of this guide is not to turn families into therapists. It is to make a small number of healthy relational behaviours easier to practise.

1. Make room for undivided attention

Give the person a period in which they do not have to compete with a phone, television or another task. Attention is not treatment, but it communicates that the relationship matters.

2. Listen before trying to solve

Ask what the person needs before giving advice. Sometimes they need information; sometimes they need company; sometimes they need professional help. Do not assume you know which one without asking.

3. Ask what may be happening beneath behaviour

Replace immediate judgement with curiosity. Ask what changed, what the person is experiencing and what context may be missing. Curiosity must not become interrogation.

4. Replace comparison with individual growth

Compare a person, where useful, with their own earlier functioning rather than with a neighbour, sibling or classmate. Notice effort and progress while still maintaining appropriate expectations.

5. Combine warmth with appropriate boundaries

Love does not require unlimited permission. Boundaries can be clear without humiliation, threats or violence. Expectations should change as children become more capable of making decisions.

6. Repair after ordinary conflict

If you were unfair, acknowledge it. If you caused harm, take responsibility. If the other person caused harm, discuss it without turning the conversation into a trial. Repair requires changed behaviour, not only an apology.

7. Protect people from violence and coercion

Physical punishment, threats, humiliation, intimidation and coercive control should not be normalised as family discipline. When someone is unsafe, prioritise protection and appropriate external support.

8. Know when to seek professional help

Seek assessment when distress is persistent, significantly impairs functioning, produces marked changes in sleep, appetite, concentration or behaviour, involves substantial withdrawal, or includes self-harm or suicide-related thoughts. Urgent risk requires urgent professional or emergency support.

A note on corporal punishment

The evidence base does not support using physical punishment as a model of healthy family functioning. The international literature on corporal punishment and child outcomes raises substantial concerns, and WHO parenting guidance emphasises reducing maltreatment and harsh parenting. The school-specific meta-analysis by Visser et al. (2022) should not be misapplied to family settings; it concerns school corporal punishment. The white paper therefore uses WHO parenting guidance for the broader parenting context and treats safety from violence as a cross-cutting safeguard.

When family support is not enough

Families should not be expected to decide whether someone 'has a mental illness' before seeking help. The practical threshold is impairment, persistence, significant change, risk or uncertainty.

Professional assessment becomes particularly important when symptoms are severe, prolonged, recurrent, associated with major functional decline, or accompanied by self-harm or suicide-related concerns. Some situations require urgent or specialist intervention.

The central message is not that family support ends when professional care begins. It changes role. The family can remain a source of practical and emotional support while appropriately qualified professionals take responsibility for assessment and treatment.

CONCLUSION — WHO DEFENDS THE MIND?

The symposium dialogue evening opened with a provocation and closed with an appeal.

The provocation was simple: we know how nations defend their borders and how technology extends our ability to protect what matters, but who defends the mind? The appeal was equally simple: do not fight your battles alone.

Between these two ideas lies the argument of this white paper.

At its heart, that argument is an act of translation. The Symposium dialogue offered spiritual wisdom through images of safe spaces, emotional deposits, listening, bridges and preparation before crisis. The scientific literature gives us related concepts through research on social

connection, family relationships, parenting, communication, help-seeking, caregiving and mental-health care. Dr. Pratima Murthy's clinical perspective added an essential boundary: relationships matter, but there are circumstances in which distress moves beyond what families can safely manage and professional care becomes necessary.

These perspectives need not compete. They illuminate different dimensions of the same human problem.

The family is one of India's most widespread and potentially influential environments for mental-health promotion and early support. Its importance lies in the ordinary experiences through which psychological life unfolds: being heard, receiving attention, experiencing belonging, developing autonomy, repairing conflict and knowing that support is available during adversity. These are not substitutes for clinical interventions, but neither are they trivial. Many of the relational capabilities discussed throughout this paper are learnable.

That is an important source of hope.

But hope must remain honest.

A strong family is not one in which nobody struggles. It is not one that keeps every difficulty inside the household, demands silence in the name of strength, or assumes that love alone can resolve serious psychological problems. Families can support recognition, connection and help-seeking. They can also become sources of violence, coercion, abuse, neglect or severe conflict. Where this occurs, the system must be capable of protecting the person.

This is why family support cannot be placed in opposition to professional care.

Serious or persistent mental-health difficulties may require assessment, psychological intervention, psychiatric care, rehabilitation or crisis intervention. Families should be partners in that process, not substitutes for it. At the same time, professional services cannot be expected to resolve every condition surrounding a person's mental health. A clinician cannot repair poverty, unsafe housing or family violence within a clinical session. A school cannot become a mental-health clinic. A community worker cannot be expected to function as a specialist clinician.

The responsibility is therefore distributed.

The argument of this white paper moves outward accordingly: from the person, to relationships, family, community, institutions and finally the mental-health system and wider social conditions. Each level has a role, each has limits, and each must be connected to the others.

This is what gives the idea of a connected ecosystem its practical meaning.

The task is not simply to ask families to do more. It is to strengthen what families can reasonably provide while ensuring that communities, schools, workplaces, primary care, specialist services and social systems can respond when family support is insufficient.

The question therefore becomes more practical:

When a person begins to struggle, what happens next?

Does someone notice?

Can the person speak?

Is the environment safe?

Does someone know what to do?

Does the family know what it can do—and what it cannot?

Is there a pathway to appropriate help?

Can that help be reached and continued?

Is the caregiver supported?

And if the family itself is the source of danger, is there somewhere else the person can turn?

These questions bring the conversation back to the central theme.

The metaphors of the Symposium—safe spaces, emotional deposits, bridges, nests, wings and safety nets—give us a language for thinking about relationships. Science gives those metaphors their necessary boundaries. A safe space cannot replace treatment. An emotional deposit cannot excuse abuse. A bridge is meaningful only if it leads to appropriate care. And giving someone wings must include genuine autonomy, not merely freedom within predetermined expectations.

We therefore do not have to choose between wisdom and science.

Wisdom can remind us why connection matters.

Science must help us determine what helps, what harms, for whom, and under what conditions.

The goal is neither to return to an imagined past in which families solved everything nor to create a future in which psychological care is entirely outsourced to professionals.

It is to build something more connected:

families with greater relational capability, communities that remain connected, institutions that recognise and respond, accessible and appropriate mental-health services, supported caregivers, trained professionals, and systems that protect safety, dignity and continuity of care.

The answer to “Who defends the mind?” is therefore not one person.

It is a network.

The mind is defended in relationship.

It is protected by safety.

It is strengthened by capability.

It is supported by community.

And when support is no longer enough, it must be met by care.

The work may begin at home.

But the defence of the mind cannot end there. Not every battle is visible, and not every wound is shown. But healing begins when no one walks alone.

ANNEX 1 — CLAIMS THIS WHITE PAPER DELIBERATELY DOES NOT MAKE

That joint families are inherently healthier than nuclear families.

That nuclear families cause loneliness or mental illness.

That traditional parents were universally better parents.

That younger generations are inherently less resilient.

That strong people do not experience serious distress.

That family support can replace psychotherapy, psychiatric care or other professional treatment.

That parents cause mental illness in their children as a general rule.

That technology is destroying families.

That Indian culture is inherently protective against mental illness.

That a single relational practice can resolve most mental-health problems.

That family cohesion is the same thing as secure attachment.

That a metaphor such as the emotional bank account is a validated clinical intervention.

That a community worker can replace a specialist clinician.

That a programme is effective merely because it is feasible or popular.

That an association found in a cross-sectional study establishes causality.

ANNEX 2 — METHODOLOGY

Source streams

The white paper uses two principal source streams: (1) the supplied Symposium dialogue, including the event proceedings, principal address, conversation, audience questions and closing reflections; and (2) scientific and policy literature. Scientific Papers were then used according to evidentiary role rather than given equal space. The paper also uses authoritative international guidance and Indian public-health and policy sources where necessary to establish guidance, service architecture or broader context.

Attribution

The event's non-clinical/spiritual material is referred to as symposium dialogue. Dr. Pratima Murthy named where her clinical or psychiatric perspective is relevant. Scientific claims are independently sourced and are not treated as scientifically established merely because a similar idea appeared in the dialogue.

A methodological principle governs the manuscript: Symposium synthesises; the evidence constrains; the paper interprets and proposes. Recommendations in this white paper are the institutional contribution of the paper and should not be read as the individual positions of the speakers or as the policy of any government body.

Limitations

This is not an exhaustive systematic review of all family and mental-health evidence in India or globally.

The 19 scientific papers are heterogeneous in design, population and setting; some are qualitative, conceptual, policy or service reviews rather than efficacy studies.

Several Indian studies are clinic-based, region-specific or based on small qualitative samples and therefore should not be generalised beyond their designs.

Cross-sectional associations are not presented as causal effects.

Conceptual frameworks and policy proposals are not presented as validated interventions.

Current service statistics and programme details should be checked against the latest official release immediately before public publication.

REFERENCES

- Balamurugan, G., Sevak, S., Gurung, K., & Vijayarani, M. (2024). Mental health issues among school children and adolescents in India: A systematic review. *Cureus*, 16(5), e61035. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.61035>
- Bian, Y., Jin, K., & Zhang, Y. (2024). The association between family cohesion and depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 355, 220–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2024.03.138>
- D'Souza, S., & Kapoor, B. (2024). Bargaining freedoms: How women in urban India experience a sense of agency. *Human Arenas*, 9, 1315–1334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-024-00444-z>
- Deb, S., & Deb, S. (2025). Mental health status of school students in India: The role of school-based family counselling. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, 35(1), 78–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20556365251321202>
- Ezhumalai, S., & Ranganathan, M. (2023). Family Fellowship Society for Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services (1993–2019): A self-help movement. *Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation and Mental Health*, 11(1), 121–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40737-023-00345-4>
- Ganie, A. U. R., Ammapattian, T., Jangam, K. V., Kommu, J. V. S., & Paul, F. A. (2026). Socio-economic status, poverty, and income inequality as determinants of mental health and psychosocial functioning among children: A clinic-based cross-sectional study. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 31(1), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13591045251391839>
- Gautam, L., Joshi, M. N., Purandare, J., & Sathe, H. S. (2025). Parental views on childhood mental health in rural central India: A community-based observational study. *Archives of Mental Health*, 26, 181–186.
- Gorla, L., Lansford, J. E., Mukherji, A., Vera-Hernández, M., Mohanan, M., & Maselko, J. (2026). Household living conditions and mental health of youth and adults: Differences between urban and rural regions. *BMC Psychology*, 14, 1124. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-026-04906-7>
- Gupta, P., & Sengupta, A. (2025). Grandmothers' experience of caregiving to grandchildren while at their children's residence: Analyzing urban Indian families. *Family Relations*, 74(4), 2040–2064. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.13205>
- Jain, S., Pillai, P., & Mathias, K. (2024). Opening up the 'black-box': What strategies do community mental health workers use to address the social dimensions of mental health? *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 59(3), 493–502. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-023-02582-1>

- Joy, L. K., Kunjumon, L. E., Anil, A., Jaisankar, M., Fariha, A., Naufal, N. Z., Santhosh, S. P., Kallazhi, A., & Tan, C.-S. (2024). The roles of social support, family support, coping strategies, and financial safety in posttraumatic growth among COVID-19 survivors in Kerala. *Current Psychology*, 43, 17766–17770. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05175-y>
- Kallakuri, S., Kaistha, P., Maulik, P. K., & Hackett, M. L. (2026). Barriers and facilitators for adolescents seeking mental health care in India: A systematic review. *SSM – Mental Health*, 10, 100652. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmmh.2026.100652>
- Lillekroken, D., Halvorsrud, L., Bjørge, H., Gandhi, S., Sivakumar, P. T., & Goyal, A. R. (2024). Caregivers' experiences, challenges, and needs in caring for people with dementia in India: A scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 24, 1661. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-024-12146-x>
- Mahanta, P., Paul, F. A., & Singh, A. (2026). School mental health in India: A narrative review of adolescent challenges, interventions, and implementation gaps. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 21(1), 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450128.2025.2535359>
- Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. (2026). National Mental Health Programme and Tele-MANAS. Directorate General of Health Services. <https://dghs.mohfw.gov.in/national-mental-health-programme.php>
- National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences. (2016). National Mental Health Survey of India, 2015–16: Prevalence, patterns and outcomes. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
- Pandya, A., Shah, K., Chauhan, A., & Saha, S. (2020). Innovative mental health initiatives in India: A scope for strengthening primary healthcare services. *Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 9(2), 502–507. https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_977_19
- Pradhan, M. R., & Pratik, S. (2025). Childhood exposure to interparental violence and mental health outcomes among men in India. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 163, 107361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2025.107361>
- Raj, J., Goyal, N., & Senthil, M. (2025). Family mental health in India: A 10-year systematic review. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 13(4), 1691–1705. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1304.155>
- Rajeev, S. P., Nair, G. M., Krishna, K. K., & Maria, C. (2025). India's silent struggle: A scoping review on postpartum depression in the land of a billion mothers. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 47(3), 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176241245773>

- Roy, A., & Angothu, H. (2026). Mental Healthcare Act 2017: Implications for rehabilitation of persons with mental illness in India. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 117, 104869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aip.2026.104869>
- Saikia, N., Sinha, M., Muraleedharan, M., & Jadhav, S. (2026). Mental health and caregiver burden among caregivers of children with congenital anomalies in urban slums of India: A qualitative inquiry. *Discover Psychology*, 6, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00576-5>
- Singh, D., Nasir, S., Sharma, J., Giménez-Llort, L., & Shahnawaz, M. G. (2024). Psychological distress in low-income and economically marginalized populations in India: Protective and risk factors. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(2), 92. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14020092>
- Visser, L. N., van der Put, C. E., & Assink, M. (2022). The association between school corporal punishment and child developmental outcomes: A meta-analytic review. *Children*, 9(3), 383. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9030383>
- World Health Organization. (2023). WHO guidelines on parenting interventions to prevent maltreatment and enhance parent–child relationships with children aged 0–17 years. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240065505>
- World Health Organization. (2024). Designing, implementing, evaluating and scaling up parenting interventions: A handbook for decision-makers and implementers. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240095595>
- World Health Organization Commission on Social Connection. (2025). From loneliness to social connection: Charting a path to healthier societies. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/978240112360>
- World Health Organization. (2023). Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) guideline for mental, neurological and substance use disorders.

The Institution

Trustees, Advisory Board & Leadership

Symposium is guided by a Board of Trustees and an Advisory Board of leaders drawn from government, industry, academia, and the professions, and is led operationally by its Chief Executive Officer. This page records the individuals whose stewardship shapes the forum's direction.

Board of Trustees

- Mr. Girish Mallpani — Founding Trustee & Chairperson; CMD, MPM Group
- Sri. Jayesh Ranjan, IAS — Trustee; Special Chief Secretary, Government of Telangana
- Shri S. P. Singh, IAS (Retd.) — Trustee; Former Chief Secretary, Government of Telangana
- Dr. Sameer Sharma, IAS — Trustee; Former Chief Secretary, Government of Telangana
- Prof. Ashwini Chhatre — Trustee; Indian School of Business
- Mr. Srikanth Porika — Trustee; Founder & CEO – virinchiAI, Inc
- Mr. Krishna Kumar Maheshwari — Trustee; Managing Director, CIL Securities Limited
- Ms. Shruti Mallpani — Trustee; Executive Director, MPM
- Mr. Tanisq Mallpani — Trustee; Director, MPM
- Mr. A.G. Ravindranath Reddy (AGR) — Trustee; Founder and Chairman, AGR Advisors LLP

Advisory Board

- Mr. Rahul Mitra — Advisor; Founder & Director – TAD Global Branding Pvt Ltd.
- Mr. Harish Chandra Prasad — Advisor; Founder – Malaxmi

Chief Executive Officer

Wing Commander Asha Vasisht — Chief Executive Officer, Symposium

Leadership details are drawn from Symposium's public record as of mid-2026 and may evolve as the forum grows. For the current roster, see symposium.org.in/about-us.

About Symposium

Symposium is a curated community of India's foremost thinkers, leaders, and practitioners, united by an uncommon appetite for ideas, dialogue, and the kinds of relationships that shape what comes next. Founded by Mr Girish Mallpani, Symposium evolved from the Altis Knowledge Club and is headquartered in Hyderabad. The Symposium White Paper Series carries the institution's curated dialogue into the policy rooms where its conclusions need to be heard. symposium.org.in



SYMPOSIUM

Where Visionaries Converge

TITLE SPONSOR

Shalimar

ROLLER FLOUR MILL

FOUNDING PATRON



INSTITUTIONAL PATRON



KNOWLEDGE PARTNER



ASSOCIATE PARTNER



✉ info@symposium.org.in  www.symposium.org.in