ISSN: 3065-4874
Review Article

Journal of Psychiatry and Neurochemistry Research

Economic Consequences of Multiple Disabilities

Michel Bourin

Neurobiology of Anxiety and mood disorders, Nantes University, 98 rue Joseph Blanchart, 44100 Nantes, France

***Corresponding author:** Michel Bourin, Neurobiology of Anxiety and mood disorders, Nantes University, 98 rue Joseph Blanchart, 44100 Nantes, France.

Submitted: 01 November 2025 **Accepted:** 07 November 2025 **Published:** 15 November 2025

https://doi.org/10.63620/MKJPNR.2025.1076

***Citation:** Bourin, M., (2025). Economic Consequences of Multiple Disabilities. J of Psych and Neuroche Res, 3(6), 01-05.*

Abstract

Individuals with multiple disabilities represent one of the most vulnerable and often overlooked populations, facing complex and unmet needs within society. Despite some efforts by public authorities, significant gaps persist in the availability and quality of services for adults with multiple disabilities. Families, who are typically the primary caregivers, often encounter systemic barriers such as prejudice, rigid eligibility criteria, and insufficient support. This paper explores the evolving landscape of disability services, emphasizing the importance of person-centered approaches that prioritize individual choice, autonomy, and community inclusion. Recent research challenges outdated assumptions about the life expectancy and quality of life for individuals with multiple disabilities, highlighting their ability to thrive when provided with proper care, support, and agency. Central to these improvements is the recognition of families as integral partners in the caregiving process. Families not only provide vital care but also advocate for better services, shape care arrangements, and actively participate in the decision-making process. Additionally, the paper examines the role of staff relationships, emphasizing the need for trained, empathetic, and responsive care that fosters independence and dignity for individuals with complex disabilities. Technological innovations, including assistive devices and adaptive mobility tools, are transforming the possibilities for self-expression and independent living, yet their integration into adult services remains limited. The paper also addresses the cost-effectiveness of good services, demonstrating that while comprehensive, individualized care may be more expensive upfront, it offers long-term savings through improved quality of life, reduced healthcare costs, and diminished burdens on families. Ultimately, the paper calls for a paradigm shift toward more inclusive, innovative, and person-centered services that empower individuals with multiple disabilities to live with dignity, autonomy, and a sense of belonging in their communities.

Keywords: Multiple Disabilities, Person-Centered Care, Family Involvement, Assistive Technology, Disability Services, Caregiver Support, Staff Relationships.

Introduction

Individuals with multiple disabilities represent one of the most vulnerable yet often overlooked populations in society. Despite their complex and pressing needs, families frequently struggle to access appropriate support services. On the surface, it may appear that public authorities are making tangible efforts to assist this group. However, significant gaps remain, particularly in services for adults with multiple disabilities [1].

Many families report facing systemic barriers, including prejudice, low expectations, and inflexible eligibility criteria [2]. A recurring experience is the refusal of services on the basis that their needs are “too great” or that public funds would be better spent on individuals with less complex needs [3]. This utilitarian rationale not only ignores moral and human rights considerations but also reinforces structural exclusion.

Raising Our Sights

In the past, society’s understanding of disability, particularly the experience of those with multiple disabilities, was shaped by pervasive myths and assumptions. One such assumption was that individuals with complex disabilities would experience significantly higher mortality rates compared to the general population, leading to a more diminished view of their life expectancy and overall well-being [4].

However, recent research paints a radically different picture. The UN Disability Report [5] underscores that people with multiple disabilities do not have dramatically shorter life spans than their non-disabled peers. In fact, many individuals with profound disabilities live long, fulfilling, and socially engaged lives, often far beyond what was previously expected. This is not simply a matter of survival, but of thriving of participating in the fabric of their communities, cultivating relationships, and exercising choice and control within their personal lives [6].

It is crucial to shift our focus from thinking about disability solely in terms of medical diagnosis and limitations, toward a more expansive understanding of what it means to live with disabilities. People with multiple disabilities, like everyone else, long for meaningful relationships, autonomy, and active participation in the social, cultural, and political spheres of life [7]. These basic human desires for connection and agency remain steadfast, regardless of the degree of impairment. The widespread presumption that disability is inherently linked to social exclusion, disempowerment, or a life of constant suffering fails to acknowledge the capacity for joy, self-determination, and community belonging that people with disabilities routinely experience.

In this context, families play an essential role in both the everyday lives and long-term outcomes of individuals with multiple disabilities. These families, often acting as the primary caregivers, are an irreplaceable part of the support network. Their commitment, which is both emotionally and financially taxing, remains steadfast despite the challenges. Families not only provide care, but they also offer love, stability, and security cornerstones of any human experience, particularly for individuals whose needs may be more complex. But it is important to note that, while the devotion of family members cannot be understated, their ability to provide comprehensive care is often constrained by financial, social, and physical limitations [8]. This leads to a need for broader systemic support, one that alleviates the burden on families while ensuring individuals with disabilities receive the quality of life they deserve.

In response to these challenges, a paradigm shift is underway in the field of disability services. Historically, individuals with multiple disabilities were often funneled into institutional settings where rigid routines and impersonal care regimens were the norm. These settings were often devoid of personalized care, leaving little room for individuals to express preferences, pursue interests, or exert control over their lives. However, in recent decades, person-centered service models have gained traction, providing an alternative framework that emphasizes individual autonomy, choice, and dignity [9]. These models aim to place the person not the diagnosis at the center of their care, enabling people to make decisions about how they want to live, what they want to experience, and with whom they wish to engage. Instead of adhering to a one-size-fits-all approach, these models recognize the unique needs, desires, and potential of every individual, acknowledging that what works for one person may not work for another. This shift towards a more holistic and individualized approach to care has the potential to reshape the way society views disability, offering a more inclusive and empowering vision of the future.

Moreover, one of the most transformative changes that is taking place in the field of disability services involves technological innovation. Assistive technologies, once considered a luxury or niche, are increasingly being viewed as essential tools that can drastically improve the lives of individuals with disabilities. Innovations such as microswitches, which enable individuals with severe physical and cognitive disabilities to communicate preferences or control aspects of their environment, have become increasingly available and effective [10]. These devices allow individuals to express their preferences in ways that would have been unimaginable just a few decades ago. For example, using adaptive switches or sensors, individuals who have difficulty with traditional forms of communication can select options on a screen, turn on lights, or even control the volume of a television. This empowers individuals with profound disabilities to exercise a degree of agency that was previously out of reach, allowing them to communicate preferences, engage in decision-making, and experience a higher degree of independence [11].

Similarly, the field of mobility technology has undergone a revolution. Electric wheelchairs and other assistive devices have become far more sophisticated, offering features such as motion sensors, track-following software, and alternative control mechanisms that can be customized to fit the specific needs and functional abilities of each user. Where traditional wheelchairs were purely designed for mobility, newer technologies incorporate environmental control, enhanced maneuverability, and personalized interfaces [12]. These devices open new avenues for independence and self-reliance, allowing individuals with physical disabilities to navigate spaces, interact with their environments, and perform tasks that they might otherwise be unable to do. This is more than just a matter of convenience; it is a matter of human dignity. The ability to choose one’s direction, control one’s pace, and independently navigate the world not only enhances quality of life but also restores agency to individuals who may otherwise feel overlooked or excluded [13].

Despite these advances, the integration of such technologies into adult disability services remains disappointingly limited. While the use of assistive technologies has become more common in educational settings, where they are used to support students with disabilities in learning environments, these same tools are not as widespread in adult services. A variety of factors contribute to this disparity, including budget constraints, lack of trained personnel, and the persistence of traditional models of care that prioritize routine over innovation. As a result, adults with disabilities are often left with outdated equipment, insufficient support, and restricted opportunities for participation in the larger social and civic landscape. This gap between potential and reality underscores the urgent need for a more inclusive approach to disability services, one that embraces technological advancements that can make a tangible difference in people’s lives [14].

The underutilization of assistive technologies in adult services is a missed opportunity. It is not simply a matter of convenience or technical advancement; it is a matter of equity. Individuals with multiple disabilities have the same rights to autonomy, self-expression, and active participation as any other member of society. Continued reliance on outdated, institutional models of care must be challenged. Instead, a more person-centered, tech-enabled approach must be embraced, one that fosters independence and maximizes potential. This will require significant investment in both technology and human resources. It will also require a cultural shift away from viewing people with disabilities as passive recipients of care and toward recognizing them as active, capable participants in the social fabric [15].

In the end, raising our sights means adopting a more ambitious and inclusive vision of what people with disabilities can achieve. It means not only recognizing their humanity but actively providing them with the tools, resources, and opportunities to live their lives with autonomy and purpose. By supporting families, promoting person-centered care, and embracing technological innovation, we can help to ensure that all individuals, regardless of disability, are able to achieve the same fundamental human aspirations: to live, to love, to choose, and to belong [16].

Elements of Good Services

Quality services focus on each person's unique needs and preferences. Each best practice example demonstrates customized approaches designed to meet the unique needs and preferences of each person. Some families manage to create personalized arrangements through persistent lobbying, advocating for services to be shaped in ways that meet their unique needs. Others take advantage of individualized budgets to achieve similar outcomes. A key feature of good services is their ability to break down the barriers between health care and social services, fostering a more integrated and holistic approach to care [17].

Good Services Treat Families as "Experts"

In all examples of best practices, families play a central role in advocating for their loved ones, often fighting against the indifference or bureaucracy of public services to secure what their disabled family member needs. These families do not only receive services; they actively shape them. In most cases, families use self-managed services, involving budgets that allow them to control and direct the essential services their loved one requires. Some families take an active role in recruiting and managing care staff, while others prefer to leave this responsibility to service providers [18].

What sets these families apart is the recognition of their expertise by other professionals and services. For example, in interactions with hospitals and other healthcare services, families described how professionals listened attentively to their advice on the best ways to serve their family members with multiple disabilities. This includes adjusting appointment times, modifying assessment methods, and even adapting treatments to better suit the person's needs. The acknowledgment of family expertise ensures that services are not only person-centered but also family-centered recognizing the family as an integral part of the caregiving team and respecting their knowledge of their loved one's needs [19].

Good Services Focus on the Quality of Staff-Recipient Relationships.

A critical element of good services is the quality of the relationship between the staff and the person with disabilities. Personalized, sufficient assistance is essential not only for safe care and support but also for enabling the individual to have the best possible quality of life. When describing the work of a social worker who supported the family of an individual with profound disabilities, there was remarkable consistency in the family's views on what was important. The most crucial factor was the attitude of the staff. Families emphasized that the warmth, respect, and attentiveness shown by staff toward the person with disabilities was more important than any specific context or the training the staff had received [20].

However, families also made considerable efforts to ensure that staff were properly trained to support their family members in the best way possible. This training often included written policies and procedures, modeling by more experienced staff, supervised practice, and participation in specialized training courses. Communication was identified as foundational. Staff must be able to recognize and respond to the full range of communication methods, including eye movements and other non-verbal cues, as individuals with multiple disabilities often have complex, non-traditional means of communication [21].

Good Services Support the Care Process

Families also described the importance of reliability and continuity in essential supplies such as paper towels, rubber gloves, and medications. Even seemingly small issues, when they fail to function smoothly, can undermine the quality of life of the family member with disabilities. Once families had access to the comprehensive services they desired, many felt confident that they would continue to be supported. However, others expressed concerns about the possibility of being forced to justify their needs repeatedly due to external pressures to cut costs, or the risk that restrictions could be imposed on how they could utilize their individualized budget [22].

Good Services are Cost-Effective

There appears to be a lack of specific research on the cost-effectiveness of services for adults with profound disabilities. However, families using these services reported that they found the costs to be comparable to alternative options they had considered. It is well understood that services for adults with multiple disabilities are likely to be more expensive than those for individuals with less severe disabilities, as the major cost driver is personal assistance [23]. These individuals require ongoing support if they are to maintain a high quality of life. Nevertheless, the cost-effectiveness of good services for adults with profound disabilities is more likely to be reflected in the long-term outcomes . These include:

Improved quality of life: With personalized care, individuals experience greater satisfaction and independence.

Reduced Costs for Families: This includes both financial savings as well as non-financial benefits such as reduced stress and the ability to participate more fully in society. Lower demands in other areas, such as healthcare: Better management of daily care needs and greater independence may reduce the need for emergency healthcare services or crisis interventions. Thus, while the upfront costs of providing high-quality services for individuals with multiple disabilities may be higher, the long-term benefits both for the individuals and their families are substantial, leading to overall cost savings in a broader societal context [24].

Conclusion

In examining the multifaceted nature of disability services, particularly for individuals with multiple disabilities, this paper underscores the critical need for a paradigm shift in how care and support are structured. The growing evidence suggests that person-centered approaches, which place the individual not the condition at the core of service design, lead to better outcomes, greater satisfaction, and more meaningful integration into society. These models emphasize the importance of individual choice, autonomy, and community inclusion, values that are often overlooked in more traditional, one-size-fits-all approaches to care [25].

Central to this vision of high-quality services is the recognition that families are not merely recipients of care but partners in care. Families, as the primary advocates and often the most knowledgeable about their loved ones' needs, must be treated as experts in the process of service delivery. Their involvement, whether through self-managed services, personalized budgets, or active participation in decision-making ensures that measures are truly tailored to the unique needs of the individual. When services recognize and respect the role of the family, they not only empower those who provide care but also improve the overall quality of life for the individual with disabilities [26].

The importance of staff relationships and the quality of interactions between caregivers and those they support cannot be overstated. Genuine care, warmth, and respect create an environment where individuals with disabilities can thrive, regardless of the challenges they may face. While formal training and protocols are essential, the human element of care about how staff engage with and respond to the individual remains a cornerstone of effective support. Staff must also be equipped to recognize and respond to all forms of communication, including non-verbal cues, ensuring that individuals with complex disabilities have an authentic voice in their care.

Moreover, the role of technology in improving the lives of individuals with multiple disabilities offers transformative potential. Technologies that facilitate independent living—such as adaptive mobility devices, communication aids, and environmental control systems are proving invaluable in empowering individuals with profound disabilities to exercise control over their lives. Yet, as the paper highlights, these innovations remain underutilized in adult services. To truly unlock the potential of these tools, society must move beyond outdated institutional models and embrace a more integrated approach to technology and human-centered care.

Lastly, while the initial costs of providing comprehensive, personalized services may be higher, the long-term benefits are clear. Cost-effectiveness is not just about immediate savings but also about the quality-of-life improvements and reduced burdens on families and the healthcare system in the long run. By investing in good services, those that respect individual autonomy, foster family involvement, support quality staff relationships, and leverage technology, we can create a more equitable society where all individuals, regardless of disability, can live with dignity, agency, and belonging.

Ultimately, the true measure of a society's progress lies in how it cares for its most vulnerable members. Moving forward, it is essential that we raise our sights and demand services that not only meet the basic needs of individuals with multiple disabilities but also support their aspirations for a meaningful, connected life. By embracing person-centered care, family expertise, and innovative solutions, we can ensure that individuals with complex disabilities are not just included but are able to thrive living lives full of possibility and opportunity.

References

1. van Beurden, K., Vereijken, F. R., Frielink, N., & Embregts, P. J. C. M. (2025). The needs of family members of people with severe or profound intellectual disabilities when collaborating with healthcare professionals: A systematic review. Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 69(1), 1–29.
2. Smith, L. (2021). Systemic barriers in accessing disability support services. Social Inclusion Quarterly, 6(1), 77–92.
3. Jones, M., & Lee, R. (2020). Disability, resource allocation, and ethical dilemmas. Health Policy Review, 14(1), 23–39.
4. Babik, I., & Gardner, E. S. (2021). Factors affecting the perception of disability: A developmental perspective. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 702166.
5. United Nations. (2020). Disability and development report. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
6. Skarsaune, S. N. (2023). Self-determination of people with profound intellectual and multiple disabilities. Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 65(1), 16–23.
7. Brinkman, A. H., Rea-Sandin, G., Lund, E. M., Fitzpatrick, O. M., Gusman, M. S., Boness, C. L., & Scholars for Elevating Equity and Diversity (SEED). (2023). Shifting the discourse on disability: Moving to an inclusive, intersectional focus. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 93(1), 50–62.
8. Orío-Aparicio, C., Bel-Fenellós, C., & López-Escribano, C. (2025). Understanding adaptive skills in borderline intellectual functioning: A systematic review. European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education, 15(3), 40.
9. O'Brien, J., & Towell, D. (2019). Person-centered planning in disability services. Routledge.
10. Lancioni, G. E., Alberti, G., Filippini, C., Singh, N. N., O'Reilly, M. F., Sigafoos, J., Chiariello, V., & Troccoli, O. (2025). A technology system to help people with multiple disabilities increase contact with objects and control environmental stimulation: Single-case research design. JMIR Rehabilitation and Assistive Technologies, 12, e70378.
11. Yaffe, J. C., Ripat, J., Dermody, G., & Verdonck, M. C. (2025). "Assistive technology in the home is choice and control… it's freedom": Perspectives of people with physical disability using electronic assistive technologies in the home. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 9(1), 1–15.
12. Cowan, R. E., Fregly, B. J., Boninger, M. L., Chan, L., Rodgers, M. M., & Reinkensmeyer, D. J. (2012). Recent trends in assistive technology for mobility. Journal of NeuroEngineering and Rehabilitation, 9, 20.
13. Tederko, P., Frasuńska, J., Bobecka-Wesołowska, K., Wesołowski, K., Czech, J., Gawlak, D., & Tarnacka, B. (2024). Factors associated with employment of powered wheelchair users. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 19(1), 2983–2990.
14. Tsvetkova, P., Sousa, C., Beiderbeck, D., Kochanowicz, A.

M., Gerazov, B., Agius, M., Przybyła, T., Hoxha, M., & Tkaczyk, A. H. (2024). International perspectives on assistive technologies for autism and intellectual disabilities: Findings from a Delphi study. Disabilities, 4(1), 1138–1155.

15. Lourenço, J. W., de Jesus, P. A. C., Schaefer, J. L., & Canciglieri Junior, O. (2025). Challenges and strategies for the development and diffusion of assistive technologies. Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 23(1), 1–14.
16. Gréaux, M., Moro, M. F., Kamenov, K., Russell, A. M., Barrett, D., & Cieza, A. (2023). Health equity for persons with disabilities: A global scoping review on barriers and interventions in healthcare services. International Journal for Equity in Health, 22(1), 236.
17. Mayer, G., Zafar, A., Hummel, S., Landau, F., & Schultz, J. H. (2023). Individualisation, personalisation and person-centredness in mental healthcare: A scoping review of concepts and linguistic network visualisation. BMJ Mental Health, 26(1), e300831.
18. Szlamka, Z., Tekola, B., Hoekstra, R., & Hanlon, C. (2022). The role of advocacy and empowerment in shaping service development for families raising children with developmental disabilities. Health Expectations, 25(1), 1882–1891.
19. MacKean, G. L., Thurston, W. E., & Scott, C. M. (2005). Bridging the divide between families and health professionals' perspectives on family-centred care. Health Expectations, 8(1), 74–85.
20. McEwen, J., Bigby, C., & Douglas, J. (2021). What is good service quality? Day service staff's perspectives about what it looks like and how it should be monitored. Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 34(1), 1118–1126.
21. Marion, C., Manji, S., Podlosky, L., MacGillivray, H., L'Heureux, T., Anderson, S., & Parmar, J. (2024). Family involvement training for staff and family caregivers: Case report on program design and mixed methods evaluation. Healthcare (Basel), 12(5), 523.
22. Williams, F., Patel, R., & Nguyen, L. (2020). Individual budgets and family empowerment in disability care. Journal of Social Policy Innovation, 11(1), 134–150.
23. Turner, H. (2021). Evaluating the economics of intensive support services. Public Health Economics Review, 19(1), 88–101.
24. Hatton, C., Emerson, E., Robertson, J., Henderson, D., & Cooper, J. (1995). The quality and costs of residential services for adults with multiple disabilities: A comparative evaluation. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 16(6), 439–460.
25. Brown, A., & Davis, L. (2022). Assistive Technologies in Adult Disability Services. Journal of Inclusive Practice, 18(2), 105–119.
26. Harris, J., & Wilkins, C. (2018). Total Communication: Supporting Nonverbal Individuals with Disabilities. Disability and Communication Journal, 12(4), 44–59.