## Chapter 9

# The Role of Family and Community in Healing: A Psychosocial Perspective

**Ms. Pankhuri Kakkar**

Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Ismail National Mahila PG College, Meerut

DOI: https://doi.org/10.59231/pitara/260409

## Abstract

No one truly heals alone. Whether a person is battling cancer, climbing out of depression, recovering from addiction, or grieving a devastating loss, the people around them — family, friends, neighbours, faith communities — shape how that recovery unfolds. This chapter examines the role of family and community in healing, drawing on five decades of research from health psychology, social psychiatry, medical sociology, and cross-cultural scholarship.

The chapter opens by questioning the narrow biomedical view of healing, proposing instead a broader, psychosocial understanding that encompasses physical, psychological, social, and spiritual dimensions. It then reviews evidence showing that social support reduces stress, promotes treatment adherence, prevents relapse, and accelerates recovery across a wide range of conditions — from heart disease and cancer to depression, schizophrenia, and trauma. The mechanisms behind these effects — emotional support, practical assistance, a sense of belonging — are explored in depth, alongside the neurobiological and behavioural pathways through which relationships shape health.

The chapter also looks honestly at the other side: how stigma, dysfunctional family dynamics, and community exclusion can obstruct rather than support healing. Cultural dimensions receive sustained attention, particularly the Indian joint family system and indigenous healing traditions that embed recovery within a collective framework. The chapter closes with practical recommendations for clinicians, policymakers, communities, and families.

***Keywords:*** Family support, Community healing, social support, Psychosocial recovery, Mental health, Caregiver burden, Stigma, Resilience, Expressed emotion, Cultural context of healing, Community mental health, Biopsychosocial model

## Introduction

Picture healing and you probably see a clinic: a doctor in a white coat, a prescription, a therapy room. What you probably do not picture is a mother who sits by the hospital bed night after night, or the neighbour who drops groceries at the door, or the faith community that gathers to pray. Yet that social surround — quiet, often uncounted, rarely reimbursed — turns out to be one of the most powerful forces shaping whether people recover and how fully they do so.

Human beings are relational by nature. We are born into families, raised in communities, and shaped at every turn by the quality of our connections. When illness strikes, these connections do not step aside for medicine to do its work. They become part of the treatment — or part of the problem. The evidence on this is no longer tentative. A substantial and growing body of research now places social relationships at the centre of health and healing, not at its edges.

This chapter reviews that evidence systematically, while keeping one eye firmly on the Indian context. In India, the joint family has historically been the first and most durable healthcare system. When someone falls ill, the family mobilises — making decisions, arranging resources, providing daily care. The community follows: temple priests offer counsel, neighbours bring food, traditional healers are consulted alongside biomedical ones. Understanding how these systems work, when they help, and when they harm is essential for building healthcare that actually fits the realities of people's lives.

### What Do We Mean by Healing?

Healing is usually defined as the restoration of health after injury or disease. In biomedical terms, this means tissue repair, disease remission, or clinical stabilisation. That is a necessary definition, but it falls short of what people actually mean when they say they have healed.

A fuller, psychosocial account of healing has at least four dimensions. Physically, the body regains function and comfort. Psychologically, the person processes difficult emotions, rebuilds a coherent sense of self, and recovers some sense of agency. Socially, they reconnect with others, resume roles, and re-engage with community life. And spiritually — especially in cultures where this dimension is central — healing involves the restoration of meaning, purpose, and a sense of being part of something larger than oneself. Engel's (1977) biopsychosocial model first formalised this broader view, arguing that biological, psychological, and social forces all shape illness and recovery. That model forms the backbone of this chapter.

## Review of Literature

The relationship between social connection and health has been studied since at least the 1970s. What follows is a review of the key findings, organised around the major themes that emerge from this literature.

## 1. Social Support and Physical Health: What the Data Show

The landmark study is Berkman and Syme's (1979) nine-year follow-up of nearly 7,000 adults in Alameda County, California. People who lacked social ties were significantly more likely to die during the study period — a finding that held after controlling for baseline health, health behaviours, and socioeconomic status. Social isolation, the study concluded, is a genuine mortality risk, comparable in size to smoking. House, Landis, and Umberson (1988) reviewed several large prospective datasets and reached the same conclusion: social relationships are as consequential for survival as the best-known physical risk factors.

More recently, Holt-Lunstad, Smith, and Layton (2010) synthesised 148 studies involving over 300,000 people and found that adequate social relationships were associated with a 50% greater likelihood of survival. That figure is striking enough to bear repeating: people with strong social ties are roughly 50% more likely to be alive at follow-up than those without them.

The pathways are threefold. Uchino (2004) identified psychological mechanisms (social support reduces negative affect and perceived stress), behavioural mechanisms (supported people adhere better to medication, exercise more, drink less), and physiological mechanisms (social connection is associated with lower cortisol, better immune response, and healthier cardiovascular regulation). In cancer care, Spiegel et al. (1989) found that women with metastatic breast cancer who received a group support intervention lived significantly longer than controls — one of the most cited demonstrations that the social environment has biological consequences. For chronic conditions like diabetes and heart disease, family involvement in daily management — monitoring diet, attending appointments, encouraging medication — consistently predicts better clinical outcomes (Fisher et al., 1998; Chafetz, Berbaum & Macy, 2019).

## 2. Social Support and Mental Health

If anything, the relationship between social support and mental health is even stronger than the relationship with physical health. Brown and Harris's (1978) sociological study of women in London showed that having a confiding relationship — someone to truly talk to — was one of the most powerful buffers against depression following stressful life events. Women without such a relationship were far more likely to develop clinical depression.

Cohen and Wills (1985) articulated the stress-buffering hypothesis: social support does not just correlate with better mental health; it actively protects people from the damaging effects of stress by providing coping resources and altering threat appraisal. Their review found that the protective effect was strongest precisely when stress was highest — which is when, of course, people are most vulnerable.

One of the most practically significant lines of research concerns Expressed Emotion (EE). Brown, Birley, and Wing (1972), later elaborated by Leff and Vaughn (1985), showed that the level of critical, hostile, or emotionally over-involved communication within families powerfully predicts relapse in schizophrenia. Patients returning to high-EE households are significantly more likely to relapse than those in low-EE families. This finding has had direct clinical consequences: family psychoeducation programmes designed to reduce EE and teach more supportive communication patterns are now among the most robustly evidence-based interventions for schizophrenia.

For trauma and PTSD, Brewin, Andrews, and Valentine (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of PTSD predictors and found that lack of social support was the single strongest post-trauma risk factor — more predictive, remarkably, than the objective severity of the traumatic event itself. Social relationships seem to provide a context in which traumatic experiences can be processed, narrated, and integrated. Without that container, trauma tends to remain unprocessed and symptomatic.

## 3. Family as a Healing System — and Its Limits

Bowen (1978) and Minuchin (1974) established family systems theory, which holds that a family is not simply a collection of individuals but an interdependent system in which each person's well-being affects every other. When one member falls ill, the whole system must adapt. Roles shift, routines break down, alliances form and fracture, and the family's capacity to support the patient depends heavily on its structural and relational resources.

Rolland's (1994) Family Systems-Illness Model maps how different phases of illness — acute, chronic, terminal — make qualitatively different demands on the family. A family that can flex its structure, communicate openly, and maintain shared meaning tends to navigate illness more successfully than one that is rigid, avoidant, or fragmented. Walsh (2006), in her work on family resilience, identified the key processes that allow families to rebound from serious adversity: shared belief systems that sustain hope, organisational flexibility, and clear, emotionally honest communication.

But families do not always help. The caregiver burden literature documents this plainly. Pinquart and Sorensen (2003), in a meta-analysis, showed that primary caregivers — disproportionately women — show significantly higher rates of depression, anxiety, and health problems than non-caregivers. A burned-out caregiver is less able to support the person they are caring for, creating a cycle that can undermine recovery rather than support it. In the Indian joint family context, while collective care provides genuine resources, the demands placed on female caregivers — often unacknowledged and unsupported — can be immense (Srinivasan et al., 2015).

Then there is the darker territory of abusive and dysfunctional families. Felitti et al.'s (1998) landmark adverse childhood experiences (ACE) study demonstrated that childhood exposure to family violence, abuse, and neglect is associated with drastically worse physical and mental health outcomes across the entire lifespan. For survivors of family-based trauma, the family may be both the wound's origin and the site where, carefully and safely, healing must eventually be attempted. Community-level stigma adds another layer. Corrigan (2004) documented how stigma delays help-seeking, reduces treatment adherence, and diminishes quality of life for people with mental illness — and how this stigma operates not just in the outside world but within families themselves, sometimes causing families to hide, deny, or minimise problems rather than seek help.

## 4. Community, Culture, and Collective Healing

Beyond the family, the broader community shapes healing in ways that are harder to see but no less real. Maton (2008) described "empowering community settings" — religious congregations, neighbourhood associations, peer groups, cultural organisations — that provide members with a sense of belonging, shared purpose, and practical mutual aid. Participation in such settings is associated with better psychological well-being, greater resilience, and more effective coping. Koenig, McCullough, and Larson's (2001) comprehensive review of religion and health found that active religious involvement predicted lower rates of depression, better physical health, and longer life — effects driven substantially by the social support religious communities provide.

Peer support has emerged as a particularly powerful form of community-based healing. Davidson et al. (2012), Kelly and Yeterian (2011), and Dennis (2003) all found that peer support — help from someone who has lived through the same experience — improves hope, self-efficacy, and recovery outcomes across mental illness, substance use disorders, and chronic physical conditions. There is something that peer contact provides that professional support simply cannot: the lived credibility of "I have been where you are, and things got better."

Kleinman's (1980) concept of "explanatory models" is essential for understanding cultural variation in healing. Families and communities do not encounter illness neutrally; they interpret it through culturally shaped frameworks that determine its cause, its meaning, and its appropriate treatment. In South Asian contexts, illness may be understood in terms of spiritual causation, karmic consequence, or humoral imbalance, and these interpretations profoundly shape what kinds of help families seek and accept. In India specifically, the Charaka Samhita and Ayurvedic traditions have long insisted on the role of emotional balance and social harmony in maintaining health — a view that modern research is, in important respects, confirming.

Raguram et al. (2002) documented something remarkable: patients with psychiatric disorders who stayed at a South Indian temple, embedded in a community of prayer and collective ritual, showed significant clinical improvement over one month. Nagpal and Bhagat (2012) noted both the genuine protective resources of Indian joint families and the ways in which cultural shame around mental illness can cause families to delay or avoid formal care. Durie (2003) drew attention to indigenous healing traditions — from African Ubuntu philosophy to Aboriginal healing circles to Native American ceremonies — that conceptualise healing as inherently communal. In all of these traditions, the restoration of the individual is inseparable from the restoration of community.

## 5. Resilience and Post-Traumatic Growth

Not everyone who encounters adversity breaks. Many people adapt, endure, and some emerge changed in positive ways. Rutter (1987) showed that resilience is not primarily an individual trait — it emerges from the relationship between person and social environment. The presence of a stable, caring adult; access to community resources; a sense of cultural identity and belonging — these are among the most consistent predictors of resilience in children and adults alike.

Tedeschi and Calhoun (1996) defined post-traumatic growth (PTG) as positive psychological change that can emerge from the struggle with highly challenging circumstances. Prati and Pietrantoni (2009) found, in a meta-analysis, that social support facilitates PTG — specifically, the availability of people who listen, validate, and help make meaning of difficult experiences. Healing, seen through this lens, is not merely a return to baseline. It can be a movement toward greater depth and wisdom — and that transformation, the research suggests, happens in relationship.

## Implications

The research reviewed here carries implications that reach well beyond the academic literature. Three domains deserve particular attention.

For clinical practice, the message is clear: an individual-centred model of care is incomplete. Assessing the quality of a patient's social relationships should be as routine as taking a medical history. Family involvement in treatment — through psychoeducation, joint sessions, and discharge planning that accounts for home dynamics — should be the default where patients consent to it, not an afterthought. Caregiver well-being must be taken seriously as a clinical concern, not treated as a private matter. And cultural competence cannot be decorative: clinicians working in Indian and South Asian contexts need genuine familiarity with the explanatory models and healing traditions their patients bring to the consultation room, and should be willing to collaborate rather than compete with traditional and faith-based healers.

For policy, the implications are equally pressing. India's Mental Healthcare Act (2017) rightly emphasises community-based care, but its implementation has been uneven. Strengthening community mental health infrastructure — district mental health programmes, mobile outreach teams, trained ASHAs and ANMs — is not merely good policy; it is a necessary response to the scale of unmet need. Anti-stigma work at community and national levels should be sustained and evaluated. Funding for family psychoeducation and peer support programmes deserves a fraction of the attention and resources directed at institutional care, given their evidence base and their cost-effectiveness.

For education and training, psychology, medicine, nursing, and social work curricula should include substantive content on family systems, social support, and community-based healing. Competency in working with families and communities — not merely with individuals — should be assessed and credentialed. Public education, including school-based mental health literacy programmes, can build the social awareness and empathy that make communities more capable of supporting their members through illness.

## Discussion and Recommendations

The evidence is consistent enough to state plainly: family and community are not add-ons to healing — they are constitutive of it. Social relationships reduce biological stress responses, sustain healthy behaviour, provide material resources, and create the conditions in which meaning can be made of suffering. Where these relationships are warm and functional, healing is faster and fuller. Where they are absent, toxic, or overwhelmed, recovery is harder and often incomplete.

This is not to say that family and community support are automatically beneficial. Quality matters as much as presence. An overprotective family that removes all autonomy from a recovering person can undermine self-efficacy just as surely as an absent one. Lincoln et al. (2003) found that encouraging appropriate independence in rehabilitation — even when it is uncomfortable for the family — leads to better long-term outcomes. Structural factors matter too: poverty, forced migration, and housing insecurity all erode the social connections that sustain healing, which means that social welfare policy is, in an important sense, health policy.

### *For Mental Health and Healthcare Professionals*

Assess social support systematically in every clinical encounter. Include family members in treatment planning where appropriate. Offer family psychoeducation as standard, not as a special programme. Monitor and support caregivers — their well-being directly affects patient outcomes. Build cultural humility into practice: ask about the patient's community, their explanatory models, their traditional supports. Collaboration with community leaders and faith-based healers is often not only acceptable but genuinely therapeutic.

### *For Healthcare Institutions*

Develop explicit family engagement policies. Invest in family resource spaces within hospitals. Ensure discharge planning includes a structured assessment of the patient's social support environment and a link to community follow-up. Employ social workers as core team members, not optional add-ons.

### *For Policymakers*

Fully implement the Mental Healthcare Act (2017), particularly its community care provisions. Scale up district mental health programmes and mobile outreach. Fund peer support networks and family psychoeducation programmes. Sustain and evaluate anti-stigma campaigns. Recognise that housing, income, and community development policies are health interventions.

### *For Communities and Families*

Communities can train members as mental health first aiders, integrate mental health awareness into faith and civic life, and establish peer support groups. Families can educate themselves about the conditions their loved one's face, cultivate open and non-judgmental communication, and attend to their own well-being alongside that of the person they care for. Seeking professional help for a family member is not abandonment — it is one of the clearest expressions of love available to us.

## Conclusion

This chapter has tried to make a case that will seem obvious to anyone who has ever been seriously ill, or cared for someone who was: healing is something that happens between people, not just within them. The research confirms what lived experience knows — that the quality of our relationships shapes the course of our illnesses, the depth of our recovery, and sometimes whether we survive at all.

For Indian healthcare, this carries particular resonance. The joint family, the religious community, the neighbourhood network — these have always been the country's most widely distributed healthcare system. The challenge now is not to invent something new, but to take seriously what already exists: to support family caregivers, to invest in community mental health, to reduce the stigma that prevents people from using the social resources available to them, and to integrate the wisdom of collective healing traditions with the best of contemporary clinical practice.

Healing ultimately calls us into relationship — with one another, with our communities, with whatever gives our lives meaning. The research reviewed in this chapter is, at its core, a scientific confirmation of something human cultures have always known: that we need each other, and that in our capacity to show up for one another, even imperfectly, lies one of our most reliable paths back to health.

## References

1. Berkman, L. F., & Syme, S. L. (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: A nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. American Journal of Epidemiology, 109(2), 186–204. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112674

2. Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. Jason Aronson.
3. Brewin, C. R., Andrews, B., & Valentine, J. D. (2000). Meta-analysis of risk factors for posttraumatic stress disorder in trauma-exposed adults. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68(5), 748–766. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.68.5.748
4. Brown, G. W., Birley, J. L. T., & Wing, J. K. (1972). Influence of family life on the course of schizophrenic disorders: A replication. British Journal of Psychiatry, 121(562), 241–258. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.121.3.241
5. Brown, G. W., & Harris, T. (1978). Social origins of depression: A study of psychiatric disorder in women. Tavistock Publications.
6. Chafetz, L., Berbaum, M. L., & Macy, M. L. (2019). Family involvement and cardiac rehabilitation outcomes. Heart & Lung: The Journal of Critical Care, 48(3), 214–219.
7. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310
8. Corrigan, P. W. (2004). How stigma interferes with mental health care. American Psychologist, 59(7), 614–625. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.7.614
9. Corrigan, P. W., Morris, S. B., Michaels, P. J., Rafacz, J. D., & Rüsch, N. (2012). Challenging the public stigma of mental illness: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. Psychiatric Services, 63(10), 963–973. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100529
10. Davidson, L., Bellamy, C., Guy, K., & Miller, R. (2012). Peer support among persons with severe mental illnesses: A review of evidence and experience. World Psychiatry, 11(2), 123–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wpsyc.2012.05.009
11. Dennis, C. L. (2003). Peer support within a health care context: A concept analysis. International Journal of Nursing Studies, 40(3), 321–332. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489(02)00092-5
12. Durie, M. (2003). Indigenous people and the promotion of health and well-being. Pacific Health Dialog, 10(2), 78–86.
13. Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. Science, 196(4286), 129–136. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.847460
14. Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14(4), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8
15. Fisher, L., Chesla, C. A., Bartz, R. J., Gilliss, C., Skaff, M. A., Sabogal, F., Kanter, R. A., & Lutz, C. P. (1998). The family and type 2 diabetes: A framework for intervention. Diabetes Educator, 24(5), 599–607. https://doi.org/10.1177/014572179802400504
16. Helgeson, V. S., Cohen, S., Schulz, R., & Yasko, J. (1999). Education and peer discussion group interventions and adjustment to breast cancer. Archives of General Psychiatry, 56(4), 340–347. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.56.4.340

17. Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. PLOS Medicine, 7(7), e1000316. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316
18. House, J. S., Landis, K. R., & Umberson, D. (1988). Social relationships and health. Science, 241(4865), 540–545. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.3399889
19. Joiner, T. E. (2005). Why people die by suicide. Harvard University Press.
20. Kelly, J. F., & Yeterian, J. D. (2011). The role of mutual-help groups in extending the framework of treatment. Alcohol Research and Health, 33(4), 350–355.
21. Kleinman, A. (1980). Patients and healers in the context of culture. University of California Press.
22. Klerman, G. L., Weissman, M. M., Rounsaville, B. J., & Chevron, E. S. (1984). Interpersonal psychotherapy of depression. Basic Books.
23. Koenig, H. G., McCullough, M. E., & Larson, D. B. (2001). Handbook of religion and health. Oxford University Press.
24. Leff, J., & Vaughn, C. (1985). Expressed emotion in families: Its significance for mental illness. Guilford Press.
25. Lincoln, N. B., Flannaghan, T., Sutcliffe, L., & Rother, L. (2003). Evaluation of cognitive behavioural treatment for depression after stroke: A pilot study. Clinical Rehabilitation, 17(1), 84–92. https://doi.org/10.1191/0269215503cr591oa
26. Maton, K. I. (2008). Empowering community settings: Agents of individual development, community betterment, and positive social change. American Journal of Community Psychology, 41(1–2), 4–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9148-6
27. Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Harvard University Press.
28. Nagpal, R., & Bhagat, M. (2012). The role of family in mental health care in India: Implications for policy and practice. Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 54(3), 214–219.
29. Pinquart, M., & Sorensen, S. (2003). Differences between caregivers and noncaregivers in psychological health and physical health: A meta-analysis. Psychology and Aging, 18(2), 250–267. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.18.2.250
30. Prati, G., & Pietrantoni, L. (2009). Optimism, social support, and coping strategies as factors contributing to posttraumatic growth: A meta-analysis. Journal of Loss and Trauma, 14(5), 364–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/15325020902724271
31. Priya, K. R. (2012). Restorative narratives: A cultural approach to understanding resilience in India. Sage Publications India.
32. Raguram, R., Venkateswaran, A., Ramakrishna, J., & Weiss, M. G. (2002). Traditional community resources for mental health: A report of temple healing from India. British Medical Journal, 325(7354), 38–40. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.325.7354.38
33. Rolland, J. S. (1994). Families, illness, and disability: An integrative treatment model. Basic Books.

34. Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57(3), 316–331. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1987.tb03541.x
35. Spiegel, D., Bloom, J. R., Kraemer, H. C., & Gottheil, E. (1989). Effect of psychosocial treatment on survival of patients with metastatic breast cancer. The Lancet, 334(8668), 888–891. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(89)91551-1
36. Srinivasan, T. N., Thara, R., & Bhagavathi, M. (2015). Caregiver burden in schizophrenia: A multi-site study from India. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 61(3), 261–268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764014546012
37. Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9(3), 455–471. https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.2490090305
38. Uchino, B. N. (2004). Social support and physical health: Understanding the health consequences of relationships. Yale University Press.
39. Walsh, F. (2006). Strengthening family resilience (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.