Journal Of Psychology and Social Sciences
Vol. 4 No. 3 2026, 546-552
Publisher: CV. Doki Course and Training
E-ISSN: 2987-2545 | P-ISSN: 2987-8551

From Stigma to Rights: Restructuring Mental Healthcare in India Through Legislative Reform

Vibha Bose
Vib's Counseling and Family Therapy Center, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India[1-2]
Corresponding email: vaishnaviv27@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received : 2026-07-06
Revised : 2026-07-11
Accepted : 2026-07-26

Keywords
Human Rights
Mental Health
Mental Healthcare Act
Rights-Based Approach
Stigma Reduction

ABSTRACT

Mental health represents an essential public health domain and a core human rights necessity in the modern era. Despite expanding awareness, pervasive stigma, systemic discrimination, and restricted institutional accessibility continue to hinder timely help-seeking behavior. Historically framed within a custodial medical model prioritizing symptom suppression, mental healthcare is undergoing a paradigm shift toward an approach rooted in dignity, autonomy, equality, and socio-legal inclusion. This study aims to analyze the evolutionary transition of mental healthcare in India from institutional exclusion to a human rights framework, specifically evaluating the provisions and enforcement landscape of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017. Adopting a narrative review qualitative methodology, secondary literature encompassing legal documents, statutory policies, and empirical findings from the WHO and the National Mental Health Survey of India were systematically evaluated through thematic synthesis. The findings demonstrate that structural, social, and internalized stigma severely impair intervention pathways. The Mental Healthcare Act 2017 delivers crucial structural reforms such as legal advance directives, nominated representatives, informed consent protections, and the landmark decriminalization of suicide attempts. However, acute resource disparities, workforce deficits, and uneven rural-urban healthcare distribution challenge its widespread realization. Bridging the implementation gap demands collaborative interventions involving community-based empowerment, healthcare budget expansion, and widespread educational literacy.

Introduction

Mental health constitutes an indispensable and foundational dimension of comprehensive human health and sustainable social functioning. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), health is explicitly conceptualized as a holistic state of physical, mental, and social well-being, rather than merely the clinical absence of disease or infirmity. Despite widespread epidemiological recognition of this principle, psychological well-being has historically occupied a subordinate status within public healthcare agendas, frequently overshadowed by physical health priorities, resource negligence, and entrenched socio-cultural prejudices.

Globally, and particularly within rapidly transitioning developing nations like India, the burden of neuropsychiatric disorders has escalated substantially. Conditions such as major depressive disorder, generalized anxiety, bipolar affective disorders, substance dependence, and stress-induced suicidal behaviors contribute disproportionately to the non-fatal disease burden. The epidemiological crisis was acutely exacerbated in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, which precipitated unprecedented psychological distress across vulnerable socio-demographic strata, disrupted existing institutional support channels, and underscored profound systemic fragilities in mental healthcare infrastructure.

Historically, psychiatric intervention in India operated predominantly under a custodial and paternalistic medical framework. This paradigm viewed mental illness almost exclusively as an individual biological pathology requiring clinical symptom containment, physical isolation, and long-term institutional confinement. Under this custodial regime, individuals experiencing psychological distress routinely suffered severe violations of fundamental civil liberties, disenfranchisement, social ostracization, and total loss of legal agency. Society relegated psychiatric patients to closed asylum environments, where the lack of regulatory oversight fostered conditions ripe for structural abuse and medical paternalism.

However, contemporary psychological and bioethical paradigms increasingly conceptualize mental healthcare not as a discretionary clinical privilege, but as an inalienable human right grounded in personal autonomy, bodily integrity, human dignity, and socio-economic equality. This ideological transition aligns with international human rights benchmarks, most notably the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD, 2006) and the WHO's Person-Centered Mental Health Guidance. In response to this international paradigm shift and decades of domestic advocacy, the Government of India promulgated the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017. This statutory milestone replaced the antiquated Mental Health Act of 1987, seeking to dismantle custodial practices and institutionalize a rights-based framework that legally guarantees treatment access, protects patient confidentiality, enforces informed consent, and safeguards community living entitlements.

Despite the progressive architecture of this statutory framework, a substantial divergence persists between legislative intent and operational reality. Chronic socio-cultural stigma, systemic misconceptions regarding mental illness, an acute shortage of licensed mental health specialists, and deeply entrenched rural-urban resource disparities continue to obstruct equitable delivery. To address this implementation gap, this study conducts a comprehensive qualitative analysis structured around the following specific research objectives:

To examine the multidimensional impact of social, structural, and internalized stigma on help-seeking behavior and mental health literacy. To trace the epistemological transition from the custodial medical model to a contemporary rights-based mental health paradigm. To critically evaluate the structural provisions and legal mechanisms enacted under the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.

To identify systemic bottlenecks and implementation barriers that hinder the enforcement of mental health legislation in India. To delineate the critical roles of multidisciplinary stakeholders and propose evidence-informed policy recommendations for strengthening the national mental healthcare ecosystem.

Conceptual Framework and Dimensions

The inquiry was structured around a multi-dimensional Rights-Based Mental Health Framework, which integrates four primary analytic dimensions:

Stigma and Discrimination: Examining the socio-cognitive mechanisms of public stigma, internalized self-stigma, and structural discrimination that impede access to care.

Legal Protection: Evaluating statutory guarantees regarding dignity, individual autonomy, legal capacity, and non-discrimination.

Access to Care: Assessing the availability, affordability, equity, and quality of psychological and psychiatric services across geographic sectors.

Social Support and Empowerment: Analyzing the collaborative roles of families, educational systems, workplaces, communities, and mental health professionals in facilitating recovery and social inclusion.

Method

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative narrative review design aimed at evaluating policy trajectories, legislative frameworks, and sociopsychological phenomena surrounding mental health governance. A narrative review methodology is particularly suited for synthesizing diverse interdisciplinary sources, critiquing legislative evolutions, and tracing paradigm shifts where empirical, statutory, and conceptual bodies of knowledge intersect.

Data Sources and Search Strategy

The study utilized secondary data derived from authoritative legal, epidemiological, and academic repositories. The documentary corpus encompassed: Statutory and legislative texts, centrally the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 (Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India).

Global mental health directives, treaties, and technical reports published by the World Health Organization (WHO 2001, 2021, 2022) and the United Nations (UN Principles 1991; UNCRPD 2006).

National epidemiological datasets, primarily the National Mental Health Survey of India (2015–2016) conducted by the National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences (NIMHANS).

Peer-reviewed journal literature indexed in scientific databases focusing on psychiatric stigma, clinical ethics, mental health jurisprudence, and public health delivery.

Data Collection and Literature Identification

Literature selection was governed by qualitative relevance to the study's conceptual

dimensions. Inclusion criteria focused on: (a) statutory provisions directly governing mental healthcare delivery in India, (b) empirical and theoretical studies addressing stigma and help-seeking dynamics, (c) post-reform policy evaluations (2015–2025), and (d) international guidelines establishing human rights standards in psychiatric care. Documents with insufficient policy relevance or outdated statutory contexts superseded by the 2017 Act were excluded.

Data Analysis and Synthesis

Data were examined using qualitative content analysis and thematic synthesis. Statutory provisions were cross-analyzed against empirical data on service availability, treatment gaps, and socio-cultural barriers. The synthesized findings were categorized into thematic matrices to identify systemic implementation challenges and formulate strategic recommendations.

Results and Discussion

Multidimensional Manifestations of Mental Health Stigma

The analysis indicates that stigmatization operates across multiple levels, serving as the single most pervasive barrier to psychological well-being and early clinical intervention. As conceptualized in sociological and psychological theory (e.g., Goffman, 1963; Corrigan, 2004), stigma is not merely an individual attitude but an entrenched structural mechanism of social exclusion.

Social Stigma: Characterized by widespread societal stereotypes, prejudice, and discriminatory behaviors. Individuals with psychological disorders are systematically stereotyped as dangerous, unpredictable, intellectually incapable, or morally weak. Common societal misconceptions dismiss depression as voluntary "laziness," reduce severe clinical anxiety to mere "overthinking," and frame psychological counseling as an indulgence reserved exclusively for severe psychosis.

Self-Stigma: Occurs when individuals internalize negative societal stereotypes, resulting in profound feelings of shame, diminished self-esteem, self-blame, and social withdrawal. Self-stigma causes individuals to conceal their distress, resulting in severe delays in seeking professional consultation.

Structural Stigma: Refers to institutional policies, legislative omissions, and systemic resource allocations that intentionally or unintentionally restrict opportunities for individuals with mental health conditions. In India, structural stigma is evident in historically minuscule healthcare budget allocations for mental health and inadequate parity in private health insurance schemes.

The cumulative consequences of these stigma layers include delayed therapeutic intervention, intense family denial, accelerated academic failure among adolescents, chronic workplace burnout, and elevated risks of untreated psychiatric morbidity and suicide.

Paradigm Shift: Transition from Custodial Care to Rights-Based Governance

Historically, the psychiatric paradigm in India prioritized the isolation of patients in dedicated mental hospitals, stripping them of personal agency. The modern transition toward a rights-based framework reorients mental healthcare around the core tenets of dignity, bodily autonomy, equality before the law, and full community integration.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of the Medical-Custodial Model versus the Rights-Based Framework

Analytical Dimension	Medical / Custodial Model	Rights-Based Framework (MHCA 2017)
Philosophical Focus	Biological symptom reduction, pathology, and institutional containment.	Human dignity, personal autonomy, legal capacity, and social recovery.
Locus of Treatment	Centralized, isolated psychiatric asylums and closed wards.	Decentralized primary care, family living, and community-based support.
Decision-Making Authority	Paternalistic; dominated exclusively by medical professionals.	Collaborative; governed by informed consent and legal advance directives.
Legal and Civil Status	Civil disenfranchisement; punitive legal views toward distress behaviors.	Protection of fundamental civil rights, equality, and decriminalization.
Discharge and Integration	Indefinite confinement based on institutional discretion.	Mandatory periodic review, recovery-oriented discharge, and non-segregation.

Source: Synthesized from WHO Guidelines and the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017.

Core Legislative Architecture of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 represents a progressive statutory transformation, aligning national psychiatric governance with international human rights standards. Its principal legal entitlements include: Right to Access Mental Healthcare: Section 18 legally guarantees every citizen the right to access affordable, good-quality, and non-discriminatory mental healthcare services funded or supported by the appropriate government.

Right to Community Living: The Act explicitly restricts unnecessary institutional confinement, establishing that persons with mental illness have the fundamental right to live in, be part of, and not be segregated from the community.

Protection Against Cruel, Inhuman, and Degrading Treatment: The legislation prohibits degrading physical or psychological treatment, bans unmodified Electroconvulsive Therapy (ECT), and strictly regulates seclusion and physical restraint.

Confidentiality and Informed Consent: Guarantees medical data privacy and ensures that treatment interventions are administered only after obtaining informed consent based on clear disclosure of risks and therapeutic alternatives.

Advance Directives and Nominated Representatives: Empowers individuals to legally delineate how they wish to be treated, or not treated, during future episodes of

severe mental illness, and permits the appointment of a trusted Nominated Representative to represent their interests.

Decriminalization of Suicide Attempts (Section 115): Reverses the punitive approach of Section 309 of the Indian Penal Code by establishing a legal presumption of severe stress in cases of attempted suicide, mandating the state to provide medical rehabilitation, crisis care, and psychological support rather than criminal prosecution.

Structural Challenges and Implementation Gaps

Despite its progressive legal provisions, the enforcement of the Mental Healthcare Act 2017 faces systemic operational bottlenecks: Severe Human Resource Scarcity: India faces an acute shortage of mental health professionals. The ratio of psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, psychiatric social workers, and specialized nurses remains far below WHO-recommended thresholds. Rural-Urban Disparities: Existing psychiatric infrastructure, specialized clinics, and mental health personnel are concentrated within tier-1 metropolitan centers, leaving vast rural and semi-urban populations largely unserved.

Budgetary and Insurance Deficits: National expenditure allocated specifically to mental health remains less than 1% of the overall healthcare budget, limiting the operational establishment of State Mental Health Authorities and Mental Health Review Boards across all districts. Low Legal and Psychological Literacy: Both the general public and healthcare personnel frequently lack operational knowledge regarding the provisions of the 2017 Act, limiting the practical utilization of Advance Directives and statutory grievance mechanisms.

Strategic Implications for Practice and Policy

To realize a functional rights-based mental healthcare environment, multi-sectoral actions must be implemented: Mental Health Professionals: Must adopt recovery-oriented, trauma-informed, and culturally sensitive therapeutic practices, ensuring strict compliance with informed consent and confidentiality mandates.

Educational Institutions: Should integrate mental health literacy into school and university curricula, establish confidential counseling cells, and train educators in early identification of distress. Workplaces: Must implement institutional wellness policies, address chronic occupational burnout, and actively prevent discriminatory employment practices.

Policymakers and Government Agencies: Must increase fiscal healthcare spending, expand tele-mental health infrastructures (e.g., Tele-MANAS), mandate insurance parity for psychiatric conditions, and establish decentralized, community-based rehabilitation centers.

Conclusion

Mental healthcare is intrinsically bound to human dignity, individual autonomy, and fundamental human rights. India's Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 establishes a progressive statutory foundation, marking a decisive shift away from custodial institutionalization

toward a rights-based, recovery-oriented paradigm. Nevertheless, legislative reform alone cannot eliminate deeply entrenched socio-cultural stigma or compensate for severe infrastructural deficits. Transforming statutory rights into lived realities requires sustained increases in public fiscal allocation, decentralized community care infrastructure, aggressive expansion of the mental health workforce, and continuous multi-stakeholder advocacy. Mental health must be recognized not as an isolated clinical commodity, but as a collective societal responsibility and an essential prerequisite for human dignity.

References

Corrigan, P. W. (2004). How stigma interferes with mental health care. American Psychologist, 59(7), 614–625.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity. Prentice Hall.

Government of India. (2017). The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017. Ministry of Law and Justice.

Moreno, C., Wykes, T., Galderisi, S., et al. (2020). How mental health care should change as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Lancet Psychiatry, 7(9), 813–824.

National Institute of Mental Health and Neurosciences. (2016). National Mental Health Survey of India 2015–2016. Bengaluru: NIMHANS.

Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., et al. (2018). The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. The Lancet, 392(10157), 1553–1598.

Saxena, S., Thornicroft, G., Knapp, M., & Whiteford, H. (2007). Resources for mental health: Scarcity, inequity and inefficiency. The Lancet, 370(9590), 878–889.

United Nations. (1991). Principles for the protection of persons with mental illness and the improvement of mental health care.

United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

World Health Organization. (2001). Mental health: New understanding, new hope. Geneva: WHO.

World Health Organization. (2021). Guidance on community mental health services: Promoting person-centered and rights-based approaches. Geneva: WHO.

World Health Organization. (2022). World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all. Geneva: WHO. This version is now structured like a journal manuscript. The next level would be to expand it into a 12–15 page publication-ready paper with: 20–25 APA-7 references (including 2020–2025 studies), A detailed Literatur Review, A Figure showing the Conceptual Framework, Tables summarizing provisions of the Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, Recent Indian statistics, Limitations of the study, Scope for future research,Author biography and ORCID details.