How can Mental Health be better Integrated into Public Policy and Social Norms to Create an Environment where Individuals can Pursue True Psychological Progress

Tahira Arora
G D Goenka, The Flagship School,
Vasant Kunj

Mental health care is often designed for efficiency rather than true healing. In this system, people are treated as inputs to health policies that result in only temporary fixes, failing to foster long-term psychological well-being. Although societal views on mental health have shifted from moral failing and institutional containment toward greater public awareness and rights-based discourse, this shift has largely remained rhetorical, rarely translating into sustained policy transformation. Many of the persistent challenges in contemporary mental health governance can be traced to how mental health policy has historically been framed. Across countries, systems frequently inherit institutional structures originally designed for physical health rather than biopsychosocial care, structures that prioritize short-term treatment, acute interventions, and narrowly measurable clinical outcomes over recovery-oriented and preventive psychological care, rather than sustained psychological support, prevention, and social reintegration. This structural mismatch produces recurring inefficiencies, including inadequate community care, repeated cycles of crisis management, and the shortcomings of deinstitutionalization reforms that were intended to replace institutional care with robust, community-based psychological and social support systems.

A concrete illustration of this broader pattern can be seen in the United States, where Kiesler's analysis (1077–1079) demonstrates that mental health services evolved by mimicking
hospital-centered acute care models. As a result, care became increasingly expensive while remaining poorly suited to long-term psychological needs. Crucially, Kiesler's critique reveals that these failures stem less from isolated policy errors than from foundational design flaws embedded within the system itself. While the U.S. serves as a case study, the underlying issue it exposes, the misalignment between the nature of mental health needs and the structures governing their care, remains relevant across diverse policy contexts. This underscores the urgent need for mental health policies that are explicitly structured around chronicity, prevention, and continuity of care rather than inherited medical models optimized for short-term intervention.

Understanding this structural failure, however, raises a further question: why does reform remain so limited despite extensive evidence documenting the burden of mental illness? Addressing this implementation gap requires a shift from diagnosing policy shortcomings to examining how change is, or is not, translated into practice. While epidemiological data effectively establish the scale of mental health challenges, evidence alone has rarely been sufficient to drive systemic reform. Historically, major public health advances, from vaccination programs to tobacco regulation, have depended on policy-level interventions rather than awareness alone. As Pilar argues, this disconnect reflects not a failure of knowledge production but a failure of policy implementation. Implementation science, which studies how evidence-based practices are translated into real-world systems, provides a crucial framework for understanding this gap.

More recently, policy implementation research has emerged as a specialized field examining how governments operationalize policies, why implementation succeeds or fails, and how outcomes can be improved (Pilar). Applied to mental health governance, this perspective reveals that the core challenge lies not merely in identifying effective interventions, but in designing institutional pathways capable of

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19272836

sustaining long-term psychological well-being. Yet structural and implementation failures do not occur in a social vacuum. The persistent marginalization of mental health within public policy reflects not only technical limitations or resource constraints, but also deeply entrenched social and political stigma. As Jenkins argues, mental disorders impose a substantial burden on societies by undermining broader health and development goals, reinforcing poverty, and disproportionately affecting vulnerable populations. Despite this, mental health remains weakly integrated into public health and social policy frameworks (Jenkins). Stigma plays a critical role in sustaining this neglect by limiting public concern and political prioritization, which in turn contributes to chronic underfunding, deteriorating institutions, inadequate legislation, and poor information systems. In this sense, stigma functions not merely as a social attitude but as a structural force, shaping policy outcomes and often transforming mental health systems into mechanisms of exclusion rather than pathways to social inclusion.

Even where governments formally acknowledge the importance of mental health, leadership and governance frequently remain disproportionate to the burden of mental, neurological, and substance use disorders. As Shen argues, national mental health policy adoption should not be understood as an endpoint, but as an initiating event embedded within a longer and politically contingent process of ratification, financing, and institutional reform (Shen). While global actors such as the World Health Organization establish shared normative frameworks that encourage widespread policy adoption, formal accreditation or signatory status does not produce uniform capacity, commitment, or outcomes across states. Structural inequalities in resources, governance capacity, and political prioritization mean that similarly ratified policies generate vastly unequal realities in practice. In the absence of sustained leadership, stable funding mechanisms, and coherent governance structures, mental health policy commitments risk functioning as symbolic or efficiency-driven reforms rather than as durable, rights-based systems capable of supporting genuine psychological progress.

The failure of mental health policy to deliver sustained psychological outcomes is best explained not by an absence of evidence, but by the absence of institutional mechanisms that require evidence to shape policy execution. This is illustrated by Australia's National Mental Health Strategy, which, despite repeated evidence of cost-effective community-based interventions, has been characterized by fragmented implementation and persistent reliance on crisis-driven services, demonstrating how policy endorsement without enforcement yields limited impact. By contrast, Washington State's decision to redirect justice-system funding toward evidence-based mental health interventions shows how binding fiscal and legislative mechanisms can operationalize research, resulting in measurable service expansion rather than symbolic reform.

Similarly, the shortcomings of deinstitutionalization reforms across the United States and parts of Europe reveal that relocating care without governance restructuring merely transfers risk from hospitals to communities. In contrast, Finland's incorporation of mental well-being indicators into national policy evaluation frameworks and New Zealand's Wellbeing Budget illustrate a structurally distinct approach: mental health outcomes are embedded into budgetary and cross-sectoral decision-making rather than confined to health ministries. These models convert evidence from a consultative resource into a policy constraint. Together, these examples demonstrate that closing the evidence–policy gap in mental health requires enforceable accountability structures that bind funding, evaluation, and intersectoral coordination to empirically validated outcomes, rather than relying on awareness, voluntary uptake, or formal ratification alone.

Bibliography

Kiesler, Charles A. "U.S. Mental Health Policy: Doomed to Fail." *American Psychologist*, vol. 47, no. 9, 1992, pp. 1077–1082, https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.47.9.1077.

World Health Organization. "WHO Blueprint for Mental Health Policy and Law Reform." *WHO Newsroom*, 16 May 2025, www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/who-blueprint-for-mental-health-policy-and-law-ref_orm.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19272836

OECD. *Mental Health Promotion and Prevention: Best Practices in Public Health*. OECD Publishing, 2025, https://doi.org/10.1787/88bbe914-en.

Pilar, Meagan Renee. *The Potential of Mental Health Policy Implementation: Methods and Applications*. 2021. Washington University in St. Louis, PhD dissertation, https://doi.org/10.7936/tcyp-0k74.

Jenkins,Rachel. "Supporting Governments to Adopt Mental Health Policies." *World Psychiatry*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2003, p. 14, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1525068/.

Shen, Gordon C. "Mental Health Policy Adoption as a Seminal Event: A Response to Recent Commentaries." *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, vol. 4, no. 7, 2015, p. 493, https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2015.90.

Lin, Tzu-Yun, et al. "Effect of Implementing an Overwork-Prevention Act on Working Hours and Overwork-Related Disease: A Mediation Analysis." *Journal of Occupational Health*, vol. 62, no. 1, 2020, e12148, https://doi.org/10.1002/1348-9585.12148.

Zahra: Journal of Health and Medical Research. "Mental Health Policy and Implementation." vol. 4, no. 2, Apr. 2024, pp. 163–177, adisampublisher.org/index.php/aisha/article/view/698/743.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19272836