Stress and Social Support for Affected Family Carers in a Toxic Drug Emergency

Authors: Saranee Fernando,[1] Jennifer Hawkins[1], Amy Salmon (corresponding),[1,2] Marinel Kniseley[1], Connie Long, Steve Esau[3], Mike Sikora, Daniel Snyder, James Robson

[1]Centre for Health Evaluation and Outcome Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada; [2]University of British Columbia School of Population and Public Health, Vancouver, Canada; [3]University of British Columbia Department of Psychiatry, Vancouver, Canada.

ABSTRACT

Background: This study explores the perspectives of affected family carers of loved ones at risk of an overdose or who experienced a past fatal overdose. Family members and other affected carers are essential supports for the wellbeing of people who use drugs who are at risk of an overdose. This paper aims to examine stress and support among family carers of those at risk of drug toxicity poisoning within the context of the toxic drug emergency in British Columbia, using the lens of the stress-strain-coping-support (SSCS) model.

Methods: In this qualitative study, collaborative thematic analysis was conducted using the SSCS model as a guiding framework in the analysis of 22 interviews with family carers of loved ones at risk of death due to drug toxicity poisoning. This study was guided by community-based participatory action research (CB-PAR) principles by involving peer researchers at all research stages.

Results: Family carers experienced extreme stress while supporting their at-risk loved ones, particularly relating to stress caused by the toxic drug supply. Family carers also encountered substantial stress burdens when navigating healthcare services, engaging with detoxification centers, and seeking support within the Fraser East region of British Columbia. Their experiences were fraught with moments of trauma and extreme chaos, precipitating crises such as strained relationships and overdose events by their loved ones.

Conclusion: Findings of this study contribute unique insights into the distinct experiences of stress and support among family carers of individuals at risk of overdose, with a particular focus on the ongoing toxic drug crisis and the fragmented nature of both informal social networks and formal support services in British Columbia. Interventions based on the SCSS model emphasize the importance of acknowledging the stress and strain experienced by family carers who support loved ones who use drugs. By increasing social support and information available to family carers, interventions that adapt the SSCS model can enhance resiliency in family carers in supporting their loved one.

Stress and Social Support for Affected Family Carers in a Toxic Drug Emergency

INTRODUCTION

In 2016, the province of British Columbia (BC) declared a public health emergency in response to a rapid increase in the number of people dying due to poisoning of the unregulated drug market with fentanyl analogues, which has become known as the "toxic drug crisis". Since that time a total of 14,066 people have died due to drug toxicity poisoning in the province (BC Coroner's Service, 2024). An important driver of these continuing deaths is the lack of evidence-based interventions to address the needs of people who use drugs (PWUD) alone in private residences in rural and semi-urban communities (BC Coroner's Service, 2024; Fernando et al., 2022; Papamihali et al., 2020). Our initial community-based participatory research (CB-PAR) study based in the Fraser East region of BC revealed that as their drug use increased, many PWUD became increasingly isolated and their relationships with family members and close friends deteriorated (Fernando et al., 2022). Studies have shown that family and friends of PWUD experience extreme stress when supporting their loved ones struggling with substance use and emphasize that they require support in their own right (Copello et al., 2010; Denomme & Benhanoh, 2017; Hal, 2012; Hornberger & Smith, 2011). In addition, family carers often experience internal dissonance regarding relational negotiations with their loved ones at risk of overdose (Hawkins et al., 2025). Despite their need for support, family members affected by their loved one's substance use often retreat from their community due to stigma, guilt, and shame (Coemans et al., 2015).

Since 2020, our team has been engaged in a program of CB-PAR aimed at identifying effective responses to the toxic drug crisis in the Fraser East region of British Columbia. Our focus has been on reducing deaths among people who use drugs (PWUD), particularly those resulting from unwitnessed drug poisonings. Recognizing the vital role that close family members and other loved ones can play in preventing such deaths, especially when drug use occurs in isolation (Fernando et al., 2022), the present study explores the experiences of family carers of PWUD in Fraser East whose loved ones have experienced unwitnessed drug poisonings.

This study focuses specifically on stress and support because family members often occupy a dual role of *caregivers* and *emotionally impacted witnesses* to the ongoing crisis, requiring support in their own right. While family carers may serve as first responders in their loved one's

overdose events and provide critical ongoing support, their own mental health and coping needs are often unaddressed. In addition, supportive families and other loved ones have been recognized as essential supports for the wellbeing of PWUD (Fernando et al., 2022; Mathias et al, 2024). In contrast to approaches that pathologize family carers and their efforts to support PWUD, Orford et al's stress-strain-coping-support (SSCS) model offers an alternative way to understand and address family carers' stress. The SSCS model proposes that caring for a close relative with a substance use problem is a chronic, stressful experience that can result in family carer strain, manifesting in carers' ill-health (Orford, Velleman, et al., 2010). This stress and strain can be mitigated by the presence of effective supports and resources which improve a family carer's ability to cope and, in turn, their ability to care well for their loved ones experiencing substance use problems. Conversely, an absence of support or coping capacity is understood to fundamentally undermine a family carer's wellbeing, and thus their capacity to continue supporting their loved one. By applying the SSCS model, we aim to examine how family carers navigate the emotional, relational, and systemic burdens of caregiving in the context of a public health emergency. Understanding their experiences of stress and sources of support is essential for informing interventions and policies that extend care beyond the individual who uses drugs to include their immediate and impacted social networks.

Stress, according to the SSCS model, occurs due to a combination of factors such as worry about the wellbeing of the loved one using substances, family/relationship functioning, educational and job performance, physical and mental health, self-care, and finances (Copello et al., 2000; Orford et al., 2013; Orford, Copello, et al., 2010). Stress for family carers also involves the decline in the quality of relationships, which can involve problems with communication, conflict, aggression, and violence (Orford et al., 2013; Orford, Copello, et al., 2010). This stress is often worsened by family carers' feeling like they have inadequate knowledge about substance use, and feelings of loss about the relationships that they used to have with their loved ones (Orford et al., 2013). In the context of the SSCS model, strain refers to the stressors on family carers' mental and physical health. Manifestations of strain include depression, anxiety, fear, and hopelessness (Orford, Templeton, et al., 2010).

In the SSCS model, support can be informal (e.g. provided by family members, friends, and partners) or formal (e.g. provided by professionals such as physicians, social workers, or

agencies). Social support can be emotional, material, or informational. Barriers to family carers' receiving adequate social support, such as a lack of access to resources, poor communication among family and friends, and disagreements about coping styles, can exacerbate the impact of stressors. Social support has been identified as a key factor on family carer wellbeing and coping (Hellum et al., 2022). Coping is the process by which individuals manage or tolerate difficult situations through cognitive or behavioural changes (McCann & Lubman, 2018). In the SCSS paradigm, coping can be seen as adaptive or maladaptive in terms of its outcome, but is not pathologized as an expression or response (McCann & Lubman, 2018). It was outside the scope of our study to quantitatively measure participant strain (Lee et al., 2011) or delineate Orford et al's categorizations of coping within participant responses to stress (McCann & Lubman, 2018). Therefore, this paper centers on the concepts of stress and support as articulated in the SSCS model, reflecting the central themes that emerged from our study. Given the prominent role these factors played in the experiences of family carers' supporting individuals at risk of overdose, the SCSS model provides a relevant and structured framework through which to interpret and discuss our findings.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Guided by community-based participatory research (CB-PAR) principles (Closson et al., 2016; Wilson, 2019), our research team is composed of people with a history of drug use, family carers of PWUD, public health physicians, representatives of municipal governments and the regional health authority, representatives of non-profit organizations, community health specialists, and academics as co-researchers in the rural and semi-urban Fraser East region. The study utilized purposive and respondent-driven sampling methods to identify and engage potential participants. Referrals were facilitated by community partners through word-of-mouth, and connections were established via social networks by peer research associates (PRAs) and research team members. Participants could refer up to two individuals who met the eligibility criteria and received a $10 incentive per referral. This referral cap ensured sample diversity by limiting the number of participants recruited through any single respondent. Eligible participants were individuals aged 19 and over who identified as a substance-affected family carer, identified as those currently supporting a loved one or had lost a loved one in the rural and semi-urban Fraser East region since the onset of the public health emergency in April 2016. Interviews were conducted by

PRAs at a safe location chosen by the participant within their community or over the phone, and each participant received a $50 cash honorarium for their participation. Interviews were conducted in various settings, including participants' homes and public spaces such as coffee shops and community centers. Prior to each interview, the interviewers guided participants through an informed consent process that emphasized privacy and confidentiality. During this process, self-reported information was collected on participant demographics and relationship to the person using at risk of overdose. Interview questions delved into the relationship between the family carer and their loved one at risk of OD, experiences of connection and isolation of the loved one, system interactions, the overdose event(s), and supports accessed by the family carer. In total, semi-structured interviews (n=22) were conducted by the team members with lived experience supported by a research assistant based in the Fraser East. Interviews were conducted between August 2020 and August 2021, were audio recorded using an encrypted device, and stored on a secure server. Transcripts were generated using de-identified audio files marked by participant pseudonyms. As interviews occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, public health guidelines were adhered to at all stages of data collection. Ethics approval was granted by the UBC Providence Health Care Research Ethics Board (H18-02881).

This study adopted a social constructivist framework, recognizing that knowledge is co-constructed between the researcher and participants. Data analysis was oriented towards a constructivist epistemology, with an experiential orientation to data analysis that emphasized meaning expressed by participants. Collaborative thematic analysis using aspects of Reflective Thematic Analysis was conducted between two researchers (J.H, S.F). Using the SSCS model as a guiding framework, themes were identified deductively and inductively with analysis aided by NVivo software. A priori codes from the SSCS model guided the primary deductive analysis, with new sub-themes emerging through an inductive approach to analysis. A master codebook was created by the primary coder (J.H), who created and validated the master codebook with the input of the research team. Data validation occurred through a second round of coding (S.F). The codebook was discussed between coders and resolutions were made collaboratively. The process also involved peer-led member checking through data discussions, leveraging the embedded nature of peer researchers in the community. To illustrate, analyses were presented to the larger team, including PRAs, who had reviewed de-identified interview transcripts. Sense-making

meetings were held with the research team to discuss and interpret the emerging trends from the data. This collaborative process allowed for further elaboration and refinement of the findings.

RESULTS

The total of twenty-two participants included six parents, three siblings, one cousin, four intimate partners/spouses, and eight friends of people who use drugs (PWUD). Fifteen participants identified as female and seven as male; none identified as another gender. Fifteen had lived experience with substance use, and seven participants were involved in paid frontline work in substance use services. Seven participants' loved ones were deceased, and sixteen loved ones continued to be at risk at the time of the interview. One participant fit in both categories.

Overall, family carers bore a significant weight of stress while tending to their at-risk loved ones, particularly relating to stress caused by the toxic drug supply and the systems currently available for addressing the crisis. Family carers encountered substantial stress burdens when navigating healthcare services, seeking social support, and engaging with detoxification centers within the Fraser East region of BC. Their journey was fraught with moments of trauma and extreme chaos, precipitating crises such as strained relationships and overdose events by their loved ones.

Stressors Unique to the Toxic Drug Crisis

Stress and the toxic drug supply

"I just know a lot of people are overdosing lately, and that most of it is fentanyl." - Dylan

While accounts all reflected the three general categories of family carer stress found in the SSCS model, participant narratives described experiences of worry, relational deterioration and loss uniquely situated within the context of highly toxic drugs. Throughout participant narratives, heightened anxiety was pervasive, stemming from the awareness of the toxic drug supply. This concern was exacerbated by the knowledge of fentanyl's devastating effects within the broader community, or even within their own social circles and families. Numerous individuals expressed their apprehension regarding the potentially lethal repercussions of consuming fentanyl-contaminated substances, reflected in this comment from a friend (Audrey): "Things have changed so much over the years and it just seems like it's getting worse and worse and it's scary. It's just scary." This anxiousness was a common undercurrent across accounts,

intensifying the stress felt by family carers, as the event of overdose was more likely to occur than before. As described by a man who lost a family member to overdose (Greg): “And chances are at this day and age with the drugs that are hitting the street, they’re going to do carfentanil or fentanyl […] and you’re going to have another carcass that’s sitting in a fucking morgue.”

Family carers also navigated a profound sense of loss stemming from personality changes that they believe to be unique to fentanyl use, and they spoke about the toll of supporting a loved one with these stark and intense behavioural shifts. One participant remarked on the distinctive nature of fentanyl compared to other illicit drugs:

“Fentanyl, it's a different thing. It's not heroin. Not even remotely. People don't act the same. They have, like I can, I'll see a person with, you know, morals and standards and everything and then do some fentanyl. And that all goes right out the window. […] Like fentanyl does something to people’s noodles. Even if they do quit or if they do get on a substitute, they’re just not the same.” – Evelyn

Stress in the context of acute crisis

“I have a Facebook account full of dead people from overdoses. My son overdosing like 20 times in the course of two years.” - Maddison

The overdose crisis presents unprecedented instances of loss bearing directly on experiences of overdose events. Family carers grappled with the aftermath of witnessing multiple overdoses, finding their loved one deceased or having to resuscitate their loved one from near death. Overdose events often led to a chaotic cascade of traumatic events, and in many cases, an ambulance was called to the scenes which were common crisis points for carers, who were desperate to help their ones survive an overdose event:

“I mean, there’s been numerous instances where you find people essentially almost dead, and you call 911 and sit there and watch somebody do chest compressions on them, really chest compressions on them, while you don’t know if they're going to live or die. That fucks with a person’s head – sorry to use the – to swear.” -Matt

When describing overdose events, family carers highlighted the rippling impact of a loved one’s risky substance use on larger family systems, as indicated by a spouse of an individual who died

of an overdose (Jess): “So yeah, so when you, you know, you think it just affects the drug addict, it doesn't. You know, there's a son, a grandson, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, his mum, brother, sister; there's a whole group of family affected, just because of one person.”

In numerous cases, family carers expressed mental fatigue and numbness towards crisis of increasing frequency of overdoses in the community, particularly if they were also working or volunteering in the context of the crisis, as mentioned by a mother of a son who experienced multiple non-fatal overdoses (Madison): “It used to be like when somebody would die, it was emotionally traumatizing for me. And because it's happened so much over the last four years, I'd say that—and this is a really shitty thing to say—but it's almost expected.”

Challenges with substance use systems

The SSCS model emphasizes the central importance of both informal and formal forms of social support on mitigating carers’ stress; however, the majority of participant interactions with substance use service systems were reported to have brought further stress. In fact, while the SSCS model does reference the stress that systems can cause (Orford, Velleman, et al., 2010), the many narratives in this study that speak to adverse experiences navigating substance use service systems constituted its own category of stress rather than support.

Family carers, notably parents and spouses, recounted numerous negative encounters with healthcare and social services, resulting in feelings of exhaustion, frustration, emotional distress, and disillusionment in the system. The scarcity of beds at treatment facilities or detox centres was highlighted as a particularly vexing issue for both family carers and PWUD, particularly by family carers who also worked in social service (Madison): “What should happen is we need more detox centres. We need more beds. We need more treatment centres. We need it to be easier to get into detox. Like to get into detox, you've got to phone them every day for two or three weeks.”

Grappling with the complexities of accessing care and fulfilling the necessary requirements for loved ones facing overdose risks compounded frustrations and eroded trust in the system. This sentiment was articulated by a mother whose son was at risk of overdose (Alice): “I find the systems overwhelming and frustrating and discouraging. They’re not, the systems aren’t

designed around people who use substances, they're, I don't know who they're designed for, but it's not for their supposed clients."

Family carers expressed a profound sense of frustration upon observing interruptions in care or encountering refusals of service:

"It has not helped when I have to start from scratch and start reaching out to get help and then be put on hold and then redirected, and then finally get a—And while the trauma and everything's red hot finally get someone while the trauma's done most of its damage. And then I get to someone who – I'm just one more in a line-up in their day and we don't even know each other and he's going to try and make an assessment based on one hour. […] So I find for me if I can get any help any other way I'll avoid that path." - Doug

Finding Support During a Toxic Drug Crisis

The SSCS model posits that social support can be informal or formal and received as emotional, material or informational (Orford, Copello, et al., 2010). Participants illustrated efforts in seeking and utilizing both informal and formal support systems to alleviate the emotional burdens of stress that precipitated intense feelings of despair, anguish, and helplessness. Material support was not as prominently sought or received by participants in this study, but many participants spoke of increasing their knowledge of addiction as a key alleviating factor.

Informal social supports to alleviate stress burdens

"I wouldn't still be alive right now, I believe, if it wasn't for my mother's continued unconditional love and support." - Patrick

Informal supports were often established through relationships with family members or friends with similar lived experience. These networks proved invaluable in providing support in various capacities amidst multiple confounding challenges. Peers with shared lived experiences provided a safe space for family carers to receive non-judgmental support, as mentioned by a parent of a son at risk of overdose (Anna): "I've gone actually to other women in my life who have a certain amount of experience and our walk and talks have been very helpful."

In contrast, often family carers' primary social networks did not offer them as much support, which is also reflected in the SSCS literature (Orford et al., 2013). Orford et al describe this

common experience, explaining that family carers were usually surrounded by potential support in their friends and family, some of which were supportive, “but most family members social networks were mixed in that respect and often largely consisted of people who, for one reason or another, were unsupportive or unhelpful” (Orford, Velleman, et al., 2010). This is reflected in the account of a sister of a woman at risk of overdose (Callie): “My partner’s not the person I go to for support unfortunately. It’s not the way things should be, but that – he’s the last person I would go to.”

Some individuals sought solace through engagement with spirituality and faith-based leaders, as indicated by the following account from a friend whose loved one died (Audrey): “The pastor is awesome and stuff and they just remind me that I am loved and you know, Jesus is there for me and I truly believe that he is there for all of us.” Furthermore, having shared faith in the community was valued as the act of praying together was important during times of crisis, as recounted by a close friend (Doug): “[The overdose] was discovered early in the morning and it was friends, friends close by had become aware of it almost immediately and, you know, a lot of us share a common faith so prayer becomes a very important matter.” Some accounts highlighted that mixed spiritual approaches were used to help mitigate stress and mental health burdens, as illustrated by a friend of a woman at risk of an overdose (Kendra): “I think just between – like I practice Buddhist concepts which is why I think that works, and then the AA (Alcoholics Anonymous) spiritual way of life.”

Challenges with formal supports

More than half of the participants described accessing formal supports within the community such as community services, support groups, and counselling. Several participants with lived experience of substance use were on methadone and accessed other formal supports for their own wellness such as supportive housing programs or 12-step programs. Professionals did not always seem prepared to encounter the complexity of family carer burden. One woman whose husband died of drug overdose spoke of her own confusion navigating the complexities of their relationship that did not seem mitigated by the counsellors she accessed:

“I certainly went to a number of counsellors, most of them were doing that approach, sort of took that standpoint where you have to let them hit rock bottom which, I don't know, I didn't do that for many, many years and maybe that – maybe just – honestly when he finally did go to rehab it

was when we left. So, I don't know. I don't know what way is better. I'm not sure. I still – I have no idea. But then maybe in the end he didn't tell me because he was worried that we would leave again. So, I don't know." - Melissa

At the same time, this wife and mother also persevered in accessing counselling to ameliorate the adverse effects of trauma, exhibiting resiliency in the face of adversity:

"And trying to deal with everything that's coming your way […] I've been to a number of counsellors and – since – probably 2012-ish. And yeah, I think most people sort of look at me and they're sort of saying, how did you survive what you did? Like, the stress level that you had in your daily life was immense. And yeah, so how did you survive that?" - Melissa

The SSCS model is one of the only theoretical models that is non-pathologizing and stresses the extraordinary burdens of family carers, and the overdose crisis presents an additional layer of tragedy and complexity for family carers that was reflected in our data. Participant accounts were dense with detailed descriptions of traumatic events that were often not helpfully or comprehensively addressed by formal supports, while often even exacerbated by them.

DISCUSSION

This study utilized the SSCS model to describe the stress and support experiences of family carers impacted by overdose in the Fraser East region. The SSCS model offers a non-pathologizing and context-sensitive framework that focuses on the support needs of family carers. There is a paucity of research centering family carers in the context of the fentanyl crisis. This is reflected in the lack of research adapting the SSCS model to explore unique and often extreme stressors faced by family carers related to the toxic drug supply. Consistent with previous research, our findings suggest that families can act as a mediating influence in the lives of PWUD, supporting them through their substance use (Fernando et al., 2022). However, this role is often complicated by systemic barriers and inadequate personal and familial support resources such as timely and accessible care services, a safer drug supply, detox beds, substance use treatment, and helpful peer and social support networks.

This study highlighted significant contextual factors that impact stress, particularly during the toxic drug supply and its associated strain on support systems. The unpredictable and increasingly lethal nature of the unregulated drug market has created a pervasive sense of fear

and uncertainty for family carers of people who use drugs. For family carers, this means living in constant vigilance and intensified chronic stress, never knowing if their loved one will survive each use, especially when they are using alone. This chronic state of alert amplifies stress, often leaving carers feeling powerless, isolated, and unsupported. The risk of fatal overdose riddles everyday life with crisis management, forcing carers to make agonizing decisions about boundaries, involvement, and self-preservation.

Interventions based on the SCSS model center the importance of acknowledging the stress and strain experienced by family carers who support PWUD without requiring direct participation of the family member they are supporting (Copello et al., 2009; Kourgiantakis & Ashcroft, 2018). By increasing social support and information available to family carers, the SCSS proposes that family carers will experience enhanced resiliency in supporting their loved one (Denomme & Benhanoh, 2017). Furthermore, interventions aimed at alleviating the stressors faced by family carers should incorporate mechanisms, which may include social supports, designed to address specific and acute crisis points as they arise, and provide earlier support to prevent carers and their loved ones from reaching crises, such as unwitnessed drug toxicity events (Fernando et al., 2022).

The findings from this study point toward urgent needs for evidence-based approaches that recognize the strengths and needs of family carers. In many Canadian jurisdictions, supports for family members caring for a loved one with substance use problems are limited, fragmented, or nonexistent (Denning, 2010; O'Connor, 2021). In addition, the paradigms in which many supports for family carers are grounded have been identified as problematic and disenfranchising in that families are conceptualized as dysfunctional contributors to their loved one's problematic substance use (Devaney, 2017; Orford et al., 2013) For example, co-dependency theory (Bacon et al., 2020), which heavily influences popular discourse and normative understandings of substance use within families (Bacon et al., 2020; Calderwood & Rajesparam, 2014; Denning, 2010; Rotunda & Doman, 2001), pathologizes family members supporting loved ones by reproducing narratives of emphasizing that their loved one's recovery can only be achieved through "tough love" and "hitting rock bottom" (Copello et al., 2010; Hawkins et al., 2025; Rotunda & Doman, 2001). At the same time, codependency theory rejects family members efforts to intervene in ways that reduce harms for their loved ones associated with their addiction

as “enabling” their substance use. Co-dependency theory is widely adopted in practice despite a lack of standardized definitions and assessment metrics, the presence of over-abundant diagnostic criteria falling under “co-dependency”, the emergence of questions surrounding its therapeutic utility, and feminist critique (Bacon et al., 2020; Calderwood & Rajesparam, 2014; Dear & Roberts, 2005). Navigating boundaries becomes especially difficult when family carers are influenced by codependency-based narratives while trying to stay connected to a loved one, yet also protect their own values and sense of safety. What family carers need is support rooted in nonjudgmental and non-pathologizing approaches that recognize the nuanced challenges they face (Hawkins et al., 2025).

Findings from the current study also highlight the critical role of informal supports, particularly peers with lived experience of substance use, in assisting family carers. Interventions should incorporate social supports, such as peer navigators, that can aid family carers in navigating the challenges of supporting a loved one at risk of toxic drug poisoning. For instance, social supports can offer immediate assistance through helping family carers access appropriate resources, such as local support groups. Additionally, peer-based social supports, such as peer support groups for families affected by the toxic drug crisis, can create a safe emotional space where individuals feel comfortable sharing their struggles and heightened anxiety surrounding the toxic drug supply. As reflected in the SSCS research (Orford et al., 2013) and the current study, spirituality and faith communities can also offer family carers solace under stressful circumstances. Additionally, more efforts should be made to engage faith communities to enhance their ability to address the toxic drug supply crisis, such as through educational programs or dialogue sessions.

By considering contextual factors that shape the experience of family carers supporting loved ones using substances during a toxic drug supply crisis in BC, this work brings new insights into the unique features of stress and support experiences that extend beyond what is presented in the literature adapting the lens of the SSCS model.

The findings of this study highlight critical implications for public health practice and policy, emphasizing the necessity of evidence-based interventions that are responsive to the strengths and needs of family carers. Grounded in the SCSS model, the study underscores the value of acknowledging the significant emotional and practical burdens faced by affected carers, even in

the absence of direct involvement from the person who uses drugs. By enhancing access to social support and relevant information, interventions informed by the SCSS model aim to bolster the resilience of family carers as they navigate the challenges of supporting their loved ones.

References

Bacon, I., McKay, E., Reynolds, F., & McIntyre, A. (2020). The Lived Experience of Codependency: an Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 18(3), 754–771. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-018-9983-8

BC Coroner's Service. (2024). https://app.powerbi.com/view?r=eyJrIjoiNjRhYTBhNmUtMDBmNy00YWYxLTkzMTMtMDI5NmZiM2Y1MzhmIiwidCI6IjZmZGI1MjAwLTNkMGQtNGE4YS1iMDM2LWQzNjg1ZTM1OWFkYyJ9

Calderwood, K. A., & Rajesparam, A. (2014). A Critique of the Codependency Concept considering the Best Interests of the Child. Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services, 95(3), 171–178. https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.2014.95.22

Closson, K., McNeil, R., McDougall, P., Fernando, S., Collins, A. B., Baltzer Turje, R., Howard, T., & Parashar, S. (2016). Meaningful engagement of people living with HIV who use drugs: Methodology for the design of a Peer Research Associate (PRA) hiring model. Harm Reduction Journal, 13(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-016-0116-z

Coemans, S., Wang, Q., Leysen, J., & Hannes, K. (2015). The use of arts-based methods in community-based research with vulnerable populations: Protocol for a scoping review. International Journal of Educational Research, 71, 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.02.008

Copello, A., Orford, J., Velleman, R., Templeton, L., & Krishnan, M. (2000). Methods for reducing alcohol and drug related family harm in non-specialist settings. Journal of Mental Health, 9(3), 329–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/JMH.9.3.329.343

Copello, A., Templeton, L., Orford, J., & Velleman, R. (2010). The 5-Step Method: Evidence of gains for affected family members. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 17(sup1), 100–112. https://doi.org/10.3109/09687637.2010.514234

Copello, A., Templeton, L., Orford, J., Velleman, R., Patel, A., Moore, L., MacLeod, J., & Godfrey, C. (2009). The relative efficacy of two levels of a primary care intervention for family members affected by the addiction problem of a close relative: a randomized trial. Addiction, 104(1), 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2008.02417.x

Dear, G. E., & Roberts, C. M. (2005). Validation of the Holyoake Codependency Index. The Journal of Psychology, 139(4), 293–314. https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.139.4.293-314

Denning, P. (2010). Harm reduction therapy with families and friends of people with drug problems. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 66(2), 164–174. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20671

Denomme, W. J., & Benhanoh, O. (2017). Helping concerned family members of individuals with substance use and concurrent disorders: An evaluation of a family member-oriented treatment program. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 79, 34–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsat.2017.05.012

Devaney, E. (2017). The emergence of the affected adult family member in drug policy discourse: A Foucauldian perspective. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 24(4), 359–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2017.1340433

Fernando, S., Hawkins, J., Kniseley, M., Sikora, M., Robson, J., Snyder, D., Battle, C., & Salmon, A. (2022). The Overdose Crisis and Using Alone: Perspectives of People who use Drugs in Rural and Semi-Urban areas of British Columbia. Substance Use and Misuse.

Hal, S. H. G. Van. (2012). Experiences of parents of substance-abusing young people attending support groups. Archives of Public Health. https://archpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/0778-7367-70-11

Hawkins, J., Salmon, A., Fernando, S., Battle, C., Esau, S., Snyder, D., & Sikora, M. (2025). ‘I don’t know what we should have done differently’: A qualitative study on the dilemmas of ‘tough love’ and toxic drugs in British Columbia, Canada. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2025.2493140

Hellum, R., Bilberg, R., & Nielsen, A. S. (2022). “He is lovely and awful”: The challenges of being close to an individual with alcohol problems. Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 39(1), 89–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/14550725211044861

Hornberger, S., & Smith, S. L. (2011). Family involvement in adolescent substance abuse treatment and recovery: What do we know? What lies ahead? Children and Youth Services Review, 33, S70–S76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.06.016

Kourgiantakis, T., & Ashcroft, R. (2018). Family-focused practices in addictions: a scoping review protocol. BMJ Open, 8(1), e019433. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019433

Lee, K. M. T., Manning, V., Teoh, H. C., Winslow, M., Lee, A., Subramaniam, M., Guo, S., & Wong, K. E. (2011). Stress-coping morbidity among family members of addiction patients in Singapore. Drug and Alcohol Review, 30(4), 441–447. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3362.2011.00301.x

Mathias, H., Auger, S., Schultz, P., Hyshka, E. (2024). Including families in a response to the unregulated toxic drug crisis: A call to action. Substance Use and Misuse, 60(3), 452–456. https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2024.2431042

McCann, T. V., & Lubman, D. I. (2018). Adaptive coping strategies of affected family members of a relative with substance misuse: A qualitative study. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 74(1), 100–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13405

O'Connor, D. (2021). Mothering through a child's addiction journey: Linking lived experience to the lenses that shape intervention. Journal of Social Work, 21(6), 1339–1359. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017320954349

Orford, J., Copello, A., Velleman, R., & Templeton, L. (2010). Family members affected by a close relative's addiction: The stress-strain-coping-support model. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 17(sup1), 36–43. https://doi.org/10.3109/09687637.2010.514801

Orford, J., Templeton, L., Velleman, R., & Copello, A. (2010). Methods of assessment for affected family members. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 17(sup1), 75–85. https://doi.org/10.3109/09687637.2010.514783

Orford, J., Velleman, R., Copello, A., Templeton, L., & Ibanga, A. (2010). The experiences of affected family members: A summary of two decades of qualitative research. Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 17(sup1), 44–62. https://doi.org/10.3109/09687637.2010.514192

Orford, J., Velleman, R., Natera, G., Templeton, L., & Copello, A. (2013). Addiction in the family is a major but neglected contributor to the global burden of adult ill-health. Social Science & Medicine, 78, 70–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.11.036

Papamihali, K., Yoon, M., Graham, B., Karamouzian, M., Slaunwhite, A. K., Tsang, V., Young, S., & Buxton, J. A. (2020). Convenience and comfort: reasons reported for using drugs alone among clients of harm reduction sites in British Columbia, Canada. Harm Reduction Journal. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12954-020-00436-6

Rotunda, R. J., & Doman, K. (2001). Partner Enabling of Substance Use Disorders: Critical Review and Future Directions. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 29(4), 257–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180126496

Wilson, E. (2019). Community-Based Participatory Action Research. In Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences (pp. 285–298). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_87