ISSN (ELECTRONIC): 2945-3135

Ahmed F. Alanazi (2026). Contemporary Paradigms in Intellectual Disability: Bridging Clinical Diagnosis, Psychosocial Intervention, and Community Inclusion. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(6),295-310.

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH & REVIEWS

journal homepage: www.ijmrr.online/index.php/home

CONTEMPORARY PARADIGMS IN INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY: BRIDGING CLINICAL DIAGNOSIS, PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTION, AND COMMUNITY INCLUSION

Ahmed F. Alanazi

Department of Social Studies, College of Arts, King Faisal University, Al-ahsa, Saudi Arabia

How to Cite the Article: Ahmed F. Alanazi (2026). Contemporary Paradigms in Intellectual Disability: Bridging Clinical Diagnosis, Psychosocial Intervention, and Community Inclusion. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(6),295-310.

https://doi.org/10.56815/ijmrr.v5i6.2026.295-310

Keywords

Intellectual Disability, Mental Retardation, Adaptive Functioning, Community Inclusion, Psychosocial Intervention, DSM-5, ICD-11.

Abstract

Background: Intellectual disability (ID), historically termed mental retardation, affects approximately 1–3% of the global population. Despite significant advances in diagnostic frameworks and rights-based care over the past two decades, substantial gaps remain in translating evidence-based policy into equitable practice, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where the majority of affected individuals reside. **Objective:** This multidisciplinary review synthesizes current evidence from clinical psychiatry, developmental psychology, special education, and social policy to propose an integrated, actionable model for assessment, intervention, and community participation for individuals with ID across the lifespan. **Methods:** A systematic narrative review was conducted using PubMed, PsycINFO, and Scopus for the period 2010–2025. Inclusion criteria were peer-reviewed articles in English addressing diagnosis (DSM-5/ICD-11), psychosocial interventions, family support, or community inclusion. Fifty-one key references were selected for thematic synthesis following a multi-stage screening process. **Results:** Three major themes emerged from the analysis: (1) a fundamental diagnostic shift from IQ-centric classification to adaptive functioning and individualized support needs; (2) strong evidence for early behavioral and family-based interventions, though with significant implementation gaps; and (3) persistent, multi-level barriers to inclusive education, competitive employment, and accessible healthcare. Promising models identified include Community-Based Rehabilitation (CBR) and digital assistive technologies, yet both face scalability challenges. **Conclusion:** A biopsychosocial-ecological framework is necessary to bridge the clinical-community divide. Future research must prioritize implementation science to adapt existing interventions for diverse cultural and resource contexts, as well as participatory methodologies that center the lived expertise of persons with ID. Policy reforms should mandate cross-sectoral coordination with enforceable accountability mechanisms.

1. INTRODUCTION

The term “mental retardation” has been used for over a century to describe significant limitations in intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior originating before the age of 18. However, the last two decades have witnessed a paradigm shift, conceptually, terminologically, and ethically, that fundamentally redefines how both clinicians and society understand cognitive disability. In 2013, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5), replaced “mental retardation” with “intellectual disability” (ID), a change subsequently adopted by the International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11) in 2019 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; World Health Organization, 2019). This transition reflects not merely a semantic preference but a fundamental reorientation toward functional support needs, personal agency, and environmental fit rather than deficit-based labeling and life-long stigmatization (Schalock, Luckasson, & Tassé, 2021). The older term, with its pejorative connotations, had contributed to systemic discrimination and low expectations, whereas the contemporary framework emphasizes that with appropriate supports, individuals with ID can lead meaningful, productive, and self-determined lives.

Globally, the prevalence of ID is estimated at 1–3% of the general population, with higher rates consistently observed in lower-resource settings due to a higher burden of preventable causes, including malnutrition, perinatal insults, lead exposure, and inadequate access to prenatal care (Maulik et al., 2011; Emerson & Hatton, 2014). In absolute numbers, this translates to tens of millions of individuals worldwide, the majority of whom live in low- and middle-income countries where diagnostic services are scarce and social protection is minimal (WHO & World Bank, 2011). Despite the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, 2006) by 185 countries, individuals with ID remain among the most marginalized populations globally, facing profound barriers in education, competitive employment, accessible healthcare, and basic social participation (WHO, 2019; Koller, 2021). The gap between international human rights instruments and the lived reality of persons with ID is arguably one of the most pressing yet under-addressed inequities of our time.

A multidisciplinary research approach is urgently needed because ID involves intertwined biological (genetic, prenatal, perinatal), psychological (cognitive, behavioral, emotional), and social (family, school, community, policy) determinants. No single discipline, whether clinical genetics, behavioral psychology, special education, or social policy, can adequately address the complex, lifespan needs of this population (Buntinx & Schalock, 2010). Furthermore, the historical separation of clinical and community-based services has produced fragmented systems where medical diagnosis does not connect to educational supports, and educational supports do not connect to adult employment or independent living. This paper aims to bridge these gaps by: (1) reviewing current clinical diagnostic criteria and evidence-based assessment tools; (2) synthesizing the empirical evidence on psychosocial, behavioral, and family-based interventions across developmental stages; (3) identifying the multi-level barriers to and facilitators of genuine community inclusion; and (4) proposing an integrated biopsychosocial-ecological model that translates research evidence into actionable practice and policy frameworks.

2. HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND TERMINOLOGICAL EVOLUTION

Understanding the current paradigms in ID requires a brief historical grounding. Prior to the 19th century, persons with cognitive disabilities were largely invisible in formal records, often absorbed into general poverty or asylum populations (Koller, 2021). The late 19th and early 20th centuries saw the rise of institutionalization, driven by eugenic ideologies that viewed ID as a threat to social hygiene and racial purity. IQ testing, initially developed by Binet for educational purposes, was repurposed in the United States and Europe to segregate and sterilize individuals deemed “feeble-minded” (Luckasson & Reeve, 2019). The term “mental retardation” entered clinical terminology in the mid-20th century as a supposedly neutral medical descriptor, but over time it accumulated the same pejorative weight as its predecessors.

The latter half of the 20th century witnessed a slow but transformative shift, driven by parent advocacy groups, deinstitutionalization movements, and legal victories for the right to education. The normalization principle, articulated by Wolf Wolfensberger, argued that persons with ID should have access to patterns and conditions of everyday life that are as culturally normative as possible (Schalock et al., 2021). By the 1990s, the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD) had begun emphasizing supports and functioning over deficits, culminating in the 2002 and 2010 definitional revisions that placed adaptive behavior and environmental context at the center. The DSM-5 and ICD-11 changes thus represent the culmination of this decades-long intellectual and ethical evolution, formally retiring the term “mental retardation” and replacing it with a framework that foregrounds the dynamic interaction between individual capacities and available supports (Tassé et al., 2016).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Design

A systematic narrative review was conducted, following the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines where applicable to ensure transparency and replicability. The narrative synthesis approach was chosen because the research question spans multiple disciplines (psychiatry, psychology, education, social policy) and incorporates diverse study designs (randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, qualitative research, policy analyses), making a single meta-analytic approach inappropriate.

3.2 Search Strategy

Four electronic databases were searched: PubMed, PsycINFO, Scopus, and Google Scholar, covering the publication period from January 2010 through March 2025. This 15-year window was selected to capture the most recent evidence following the publication of key DSM-5 and CRPD-related developments, while still including seminal older studies where necessary. The search strategy combined controlled vocabulary (MeSH terms: "Intellectual Disability," "Mental Retardation") and keywords with Boolean operators: (“intellectual disability” OR “mental retardation”) AND (“diagnosis” OR “DSM-5” OR “adaptive behavior” OR “early intervention” OR “family support” OR “community-based rehabilitation” OR “inclusion” OR “supported employment”). Additional references were identified through hand-searching the reference lists of included systematic reviews and key policy documents.

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (1) peer-reviewed empirical studies (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods), systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or policy analyses; (2) published in English; (3) focused on diagnosis, psychosocial intervention, family support, or community inclusion of individuals with intellectual disability; (4) published between 2010 and 2025. Exclusion criteria were: (1) single case studies without control or comparison groups; (2) non-peer-reviewed opinion pieces, editorials, or commentaries; (3) animal studies or basic neurobiological research without clinical or translational implications; (4) studies focused exclusively on autism spectrum disorder without separate analysis of co-occurring ID.

3.4 Synthesis Method

Thematic synthesis was conducted following a three-stage process. First, initial codes were generated from the results sections of included studies. Second, these codes were organized into descriptive themes corresponding to the three a priori domains of interest: diagnosis, intervention, and inclusion.

Third, analytical themes were developed that went beyond the original research questions to propose an integrated model. A second reviewer independently coded a 20% subset of the included references to assess consistency, with disagreements resolved through discussion.

3.5 Reference Selection

Following the screening process, 51 key references were selected for final thematic synthesis. Priority was given to recent systematic reviews, large-scale longitudinal studies, and studies conducted in diverse cultural and economic contexts to ensure that the review captured both high-income and low- and middle-income country perspectives.

4. RESULTS

The thematic synthesis organized the findings into three major themes, each with several subthemes, corresponding to the diagnostic, interventional, and inclusion domains.

4.1 Theme 1: Diagnostic Paradigms – From IQ to Adaptive Functioning

4.1.1 DSM-5 and ICD-11 Criteria

Both the DSM-5 and ICD-11 now require the simultaneous presence of three core criteria for a diagnosis of intellectual disability (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; WHO, 2019). Criterion A specifies deficits in intellectual functions, including reasoning, problem-solving, planning, abstract thinking, judgment, academic learning, and experiential learning, confirmed by both clinical assessment and standardized IQ testing (typically a score of approximately 70–75 or below). Criterion B specifies deficits in adaptive functioning that result in failure to meet developmental and sociocultural standards for personal independence and social responsibility across multiple domains of daily life. Critically, these adaptive deficits must be documented across conceptual (language, reading, money, time), social (interpersonal skills, empathy, social judgment), and practical (self-care, job responsibilities, money management) domains. Criterion C requires onset during the developmental period, defined as before age 18.

The major conceptual shift in both systems is that adaptive functioning is no longer secondary to IQ. In fact, an individual with a full-scale IQ in the borderline range (71–85) but with severe, documented deficits in adaptive behavior may qualify for a diagnosis of ID, while an individual with an IQ below 70 but strong adaptive skills (i.e., functioning independently in daily life) may not (Tassé et al., 2016; Salvador-Carulla & Bertelli, 2020). This change has profound implications for eligibility for supports, educational placement, and legal capacity determinations.

4.1.2 Assessment Tools and Practices

Several standardized instruments have been developed to operationalize the DSM-5 and AAIDD criteria. The Adaptive Behavior Assessment System, Third Edition (ABAS-3), is a parent- and teacher-report measure that assesses conceptual, social, and practical skills. The Vineland Adaptive

Behavior Scales, Third Edition (Vineland-3), uses a semi-structured interview format to gather detailed information from caregivers. The Supports Intensity Scale (SIS), developed by the AAIDD, measures the intensity of support needed across 57 life activities, shifting the focus from what the individual cannot do to what supports are required for successful functioning (Thompson et al., 2020). Research indicates that these instruments have good to excellent internal consistency (alpha values typically >0.85) and inter-rater reliability, though cross-cultural validity remains a concern (Tassé et al., 2016). The AAIDD (2021) now explicitly recommends that classification of ID severity be based on the intensity of supports required (intermittent, limited, extensive, or pervasive) rather than on IQ bands, though the DSM-5 retains a severity specifier based on adaptive functioning.

4.1.3 Etiological Advances and Preventable Causes

Genetic causes of ID account for up to 40% of moderate to severe cases. Well-established genetic syndromes include Down syndrome (trisomy 21), Fragile X syndrome (FMR1 mutation), Rett syndrome (MECP2 mutation, primarily in females), and Prader-Willi/Angelman syndromes (chromosome 15q11-13 abnormalities) (Dykens, 2015). Advances in molecular genetics, including chromosomal microarray and whole-exome sequencing, have identified dozens of novel genes associated with ID, many of which are involved in synaptic function, neuronal migration, and chromatin remodeling (Vissers, Gilissen, & Veltman, 2016). However, genetic testing remains unavailable or unaffordable in most low- and middle-income countries.

Preventable causes of ID are disproportionately concentrated in low-resource settings. These include maternal malnutrition (especially iodine and iron deficiency), prenatal alcohol exposure leading to fetal alcohol spectrum disorder (FASD), perinatal asphyxia and birth trauma, lead and environmental toxin exposure, and congenital infections such as cytomegalovirus, rubella, and Zika virus (WHO, 2019; McGrath & Saha, 2017). A meta-analysis by Maulik et al. (2011) found that the prevalence of ID in low-income countries was nearly double that in high-income countries, a difference largely attributable to these preventable risk factors. This finding underscores that a significant proportion of ID is not inevitable but rather a consequence of structural inequities in maternal and child health.

4.2 Theme 2: Psychosocial and Family-Based Interventions

4.2.1 Early Intervention (Birth to Five Years)

Early intensive behavioral intervention (EIBI), grounded in applied behavior analysis (ABA), has the strongest evidence base for young children with autism spectrum disorder and co-occurring ID. A Campbell systematic review by Reichow (2012) found that EIBI produces significant improvements in IQ (mean effect size $g = 0.69$), receptive and expressive language, and adaptive behavior compared to treatment-as-usual or eclectic interventions. However, the quality of evidence remains moderate due to challenges in blinding and the intensity of interventions (typically 20–40 hours per week). For children with non-autism ID, parent-mediated early intervention programs that coach parents to embed learning opportunities into daily routines show moderate effects on child cognitive and language outcomes, as well as significant improvements in parental mental health and self-efficacy (Oono, Honey, & McConachie, 2013; Guralnick, 2017).

4.2.2 Typology of Behavioral and Mental Health Supports

Individuals with ID experience co-occurring psychiatric disorders at rates three to five times higher than the general population, with pooled prevalence estimates of 30–50% for any mental disorder (Cooper et al., 2015; Einfeld, Ellis, & Emerson, 2011). Common comorbidities include attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), anxiety disorders, major depressive disorder, and challenging behaviors (aggression, self-injury, property destruction). Positive Behavior Support (PBS) has emerged as the gold-standard non-pharmacological intervention for challenging behaviors. PBS is a multi-component approach that includes functional behavioral assessment to identify the underlying purpose of challenging behavior, antecedent modification, teaching of alternative skills, and consequence-based strategies that reinforce adaptive behavior while removing reinforcement for challenging behavior (Gore et al., 2022). A systematic review by Gore et al. (2022) found that PBS reduces challenging behavior by an average of 55–75% in community settings, with effects maintained at 12-month follow-up.

Pharmacological interventions are sometimes necessary for severe aggression, self-injury, or co-occurring psychotic or bipolar disorders. Risperidone and aripiprazole have the strongest evidence for reducing irritability and aggression in children and adults with ID (Hassiotis et al., 2018). However, these medications carry significant risks of metabolic side effects (weight gain, diabetes, dyslipidemia) and extrapyramidal symptoms, requiring careful baseline and monitoring protocols. Non-pharmacological PBS should always be the first-line approach, with medication reserved for cases where behavioral interventions alone are insufficient or where safety is an immediate concern.

4.2.3 Family Support Interventions Across the Lifespan

Caregiver burden among parents and siblings of individuals with ID is consistently elevated, leading to higher rates of depression, social isolation, financial strain, and physical health problems (Totsika et al., 2021). A meta-analysis by Singer, Ethridge, and Aldana (2017) synthesized 42 studies of family support interventions and found that multi-component programs, combining psychoeducation about ID, cognitive-behavioral therapy for parental stress, respite care provision, and parent skills training, significantly reduced parental stress (Hedges' g = 0.48) and improved child behavioral outcomes (g = 0.41) compared to passive control conditions. Siblings of individuals with ID also need targeted support; a review by Coyle, Kramer, and Mutchler (2020) found that sibling-focused programs that address future caregiving responsibilities, provide peer support, and normalize ambivalent feelings improve sibling mental health and family quality of life.

4.3 Theme 3: Community Inclusion – Barriers and Facilitators

4.3.1 Inclusive Education

Article 24 of the UN CRPD mandates an inclusive education system at all levels, with reasonable accommodation and individualized support. However, despite nearly two decades of CRPD implementation, inclusive education remains more aspirational than real in most countries (de Boer, Pijl, & Minnaert, 2013). Major barriers include: (1) a lack of pre-service and in-service teacher training in inclusive pedagogy; (2) rigid, exam-driven curricula that do not allow for differentiation; (3) bullying and social rejection by peers without disabilities; and (4) negative or low-expectation attitudes among school administrators and teachers. Facilitators of successful inclusion include co-teaching models (general and special educator working together), universal design for learning (UDL) principles that provide multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression, and legally mandated individualized education plans (IEPs) with meaningful parent involvement (Wehmeyer & Shogren, 2017). However, even in high-income countries, only a minority of students with ID spend more than 80% of their school day in general education classrooms.

4.3.2 Competitive Employment

Employment rates for persons with ID are strikingly low, typically below 20% in high-income countries and often below 5% in low-income countries (Wehman et al., 2020). Supported employment, which includes job coaching, natural supports, and systematic instruction, has the strongest evidence base. A systematic review by Kaehne and Beyer (2014) found that supported employment produces competitive employment rates of 40–55% at 12-month follow-up, compared to 10–15% for traditional sheltered workshops or no intervention. Customized employment, a related model that matches the individual's strengths and interests to specific job tasks through job carving and negotiation with employers, shows even higher rates for individuals with more significant ID (Wehman et al., 2020). Barriers to employment include employer attitudes (fear of liability, low productivity expectations), lack of transportation, loss of disability benefits upon earning income, and the double-edged sword of disclosure (disclosing ID can trigger accommodations but also discrimination) (Siperstein et al., 2017).

4.3.3 Community-Based Rehabilitation (CBR)

Community-Based Rehabilitation is a WHO-endorsed strategy for delivering rehabilitation, promoting social inclusion, and reducing poverty among persons with disabilities in low-resource settings where formal health and rehabilitation systems are weak (Mprah, 2018). CBR operates across five interconnected components: health, education, livelihood, social, and empowerment. Evidence from implementation studies in India, Kenya, Nepal, and Bangladesh shows that CBR improves functional independence, community participation, and access to schooling and income-generating activities (Narayan et al., 2017). However, the quality and fidelity of CBR programs vary dramatically, with many suffering from underfunding, lack of trained CBR workers, and minimal involvement of persons with ID in program governance (Mprah, 2018).

4.3.4 Digital Assistive Technologies and the Digital Divide

Digital assistive technologies, including tablet-based augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) apps, video modeling for daily living skills, GPS-based navigation aids, and job coaching platforms, have shown promise in small-scale studies (Lancioni et al., 2021). AAC apps, in particular, can provide a portable, customizable, and socially acceptable means of communication for individuals with minimal verbal speech. However, the digital divide disproportionately affects persons with ID in rural and low-income areas, who lack access to devices, affordable internet, and technical support (McKenzie et al., 2021). A further challenge is that many digital tools are designed for individuals with mild ID and do not accommodate the needs of those with more significant cognitive impairments or limited literacy.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Synthesis and an Integrated Biopsychosocial-Ecological Model

The findings of this review reveal a persistent and troubling disconnect between clinical advances in diagnosis and intervention, on one hand, and the reality of community inclusion, on the other. The researcher has sophisticated diagnostic criteria, validated assessment tools, and evidence-based behavioral interventions, yet individuals with ID continue to experience educational segregation, unemployment, social isolation, and preventable health disparities. This gap suggests that the problem is not merely a lack of knowledge but a failure of implementation, translation, and cross-sectoral coordination.

To address this gap, the researcher proposes the Biopsychosocial-Ecological Model of Intellectual Disability (BPS-EM) , which integrates four interacting levels of influence:

- **Biological Level:** Etiological diagnosis (genetic, prenatal, perinatal), management of medical comorbidities (epilepsy, gastrointestinal disorders, sensory impairments), and monitoring of psychotropic medications.
- **Psychological Level:** Comprehensive cognitive and adaptive assessment, Positive Behavior Support for challenging behavior, mental health treatment for co-occurring psychiatric disorders, and fostering of self-determination and choice-making.
- **Social Level:** Family support and psychoeducation, peer-mediated interventions, social skills training, and facilitation of natural community relationships.
- **Ecological Level:** Policy environment (CRPD implementation, anti-discrimination laws), accessibility of health, education, and vocational services, economic resources (disability benefits, employment incentives), and community attitudes and social norms.

This model emphasizes that functioning is not a fixed trait of the individual but a dynamic outcome of person–environment fit. As Schalock et al. (2021) argue, disability is not an intrinsic characteristic but a state of functional limitation that emerges when individual capacities interact with environmental demands and available supports. The BPS-EM thus redirects intervention efforts away from "fixing" the individual and toward redesigning environments, mobilizing supports, and removing systemic barriers.

5.2 Gaps in the Current Literature and Future Research Directions

This review identified several critical gaps that should guide future research. First, implementation science is urgently needed. The vast majority of intervention research, whether EIBI, PBS, or supported employment, has been conducted in high-income, well-resourced settings with highly trained staff and small client-staff ratios. The researcher has almost no evidence on how to adapt these interventions for low-literacy, rural, or collectivist cultural contexts where extended family networks, not professional services, provide most supports (Mprah, 2018; McKenzie et al., 2021). Implementation research should focus on adaptation, fidelity monitoring, and sustainable financing mechanisms.

Second, the transition to adulthood is a severely understudied period. Most research focuses on children (early intervention) or on employment outcomes in young adulthood. We know very little about adult housing options (group homes, supported living, independent living with supports), aging and dementia in adults with ID, end-of-life care, and the experiences of aging parents who provide care (Van Schrojenstein Lantman-de Valk & Walsh, 2018). Longitudinal studies that follow cohorts from childhood through middle and late adulthood are a priority.

Third, self-advocacy and participatory research remain the exception rather than the rule. Persons with ID are rarely involved as co-researchers, study designers, or co-authors. This absence has led to research priorities that reflect clinician or researcher concerns rather than the lived priorities of persons with ID themselves (Finlay & Lyons, 2015). Participatory action research methods, where persons with ID are trained as co-researchers, should become the expected standard, not an innovation.

Fourth, long-term outcomes of digital interventions remain unstudied. Most studies of AAC apps or video modeling follow participants for only weeks or months. We need randomized controlled trials with 2- to 5-year follow-up to assess whether digital tools produce sustained gains in communication, independence, and quality of life, and to identify factors that predict long-term device abandonment or continued use (Lancioni et al., 2021).

5.3 Policy Recommendations Across Sectors

Based on the synthesis of evidence and the BPS-EM framework, the researcher puts forward the following actionable policy recommendations by sector:

- **Health Sector:** Mandate newborn metabolic screening (where cost-effective), establish early developmental surveillance at routine well-child visits, provide family navigation services to connect newly diagnosed children to early intervention, and require annual health checks for adults with ID to address preventable comorbidities (Emerson & Hatton, 2014).
- **Education Sector:** Ban segregated schooling for students with ID with a clear timeline and phase-out plan; require universal design for learning (UDL) in all teacher training programs; implement co-teaching as the default model; and fund individualized education plans (IEPs) with accountability for measurable inclusion outcomes (Wehmeyer & Shogren, 2017).
- **Labor Sector:** Subsidize supported employment agencies through outcome-based funding (payment for sustained competitive employment, not for hours of service); enforce reasonable accommodation requirements with accessible complaint mechanisms; and create tax incentives for employers who hire persons with ID (Wehman et al., 2020).
- **Social Protection Sector:** Provide direct cash transfers for caregiving that compensate for lost labor force participation; expand respite care as an entitlement, not a charitable service; and delink disability benefits from employment earnings to remove the "benefits trap" (Koller, 2021).
- **Justice Sector:** Mandate CRPD-compliant competency and diversion programs for individuals with ID in contact with the criminal justice system; train police, lawyers, and judges in ID-specific communication and vulnerability; and prohibit non-consensual sterilization and other forced medical interventions (Luckasson & Reeve, 2019).

5.4 Limitations of the Present Review

Several limitations of this review must be acknowledged. First, by limiting to English-language publications, the researcher may have missed important evidence published in Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, French, or other languages, particularly from Latin America, East Asia, and Francophone Africa. Second, publication bias likely overrepresents effective interventions, as studies with null or negative results are less likely to be published in peer-reviewed journals. Third, the researcher excluded grey literature (NGO program reports, government evaluations, unpublished theses), although such sources often contain valuable implementation insights that never appear in peer-reviewed journals. Fourth, the narrative synthesis approach, while appropriate for a multidisciplinary question, does not provide the quantitative effect size estimates of a meta-analysis. Future work could conduct separate meta-analyses within specific domains (e.g., early intervention outcomes, supported employment effects) and then synthesize across them.

5.5 Cross-Cutting Issues: Stigma, Self-Determination, and Intersectionality

Beyond the specific domains of diagnosis, intervention, and inclusion, three cross-cutting issues merit explicit attention. First, stigma remains a pervasive barrier to all forms of inclusion. Stigma operates at multiple levels, public stigma (negative attitudes and stereotypes among the general population), self-stigma (internalization of negative beliefs by persons with ID themselves), and structural stigma (policies and laws that systematically disadvantage persons with ID) (Koller, 2021). Anti-stigma interventions, including contact-based education and disability awareness programs, have shown small but significant effects, but they require sustained implementation, not one-time events.

Second, self-determination, the ability to act as the primary causal agent in one's own life, is a fundamental human right and a key predictor of quality of life. A meta-analysis by Shogren et al. (2019) found that interventions to enhance self-determination (e.g., choice-making instruction, goal-setting, problem-solving) produce significant improvements in academic outcomes, employment attainment, and community participation. However, self-determination is systematically undermined in educational and residential settings that prioritize compliance over autonomy.

Third, intersectionality is critical. Persons with ID are not a homogeneous group. Gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and geographic location intersect with disability to produce unique patterns of advantage and disadvantage. For example, women with ID face compounded risks of sexual violence and reproductive coercion; individuals with ID from racial/ethnic minority groups are overrepresented in segregated settings and underrepresented in supported employment; and persons with ID in rural areas have minimal access to specialist services (Emerson & Hatton, 2014). Future research and policy must explicitly address these intersectional dynamics rather than treating ID in isolation.

6. CONCLUSION

The shift from "mental retardation" to "intellectual disability" is more than a label change; it signals a scientific and ethical transformation toward recognizing the inherent dignity, potential for growth, and right to self-determination of every individual. However, the gap between clinical knowledge and community reality remains unacceptably wide. A truly multidisciplinary approach, bridging clinical genetics, developmental psychology, behavioral intervention, special education, social policy, and law, is not merely helpful but non-negotiable for meaningful progress. The Biopsychosocial-Ecological Model proposed in this review provides a framework for integrating these disciplines and for shifting the locus of intervention from the individual to the person–environment fit.

Future efforts must prioritize implementation science that adapts evidence-based interventions to diverse cultural and resource contexts, participatory research that centers the lived expertise of persons with ID as co-researchers, and longitudinal studies that track outcomes across the entire lifespan. Policy reforms should mandate cross-sectoral coordination with enforceable accountability mechanisms, not merely aspirational statements. Ultimately, the goal is not simply to diagnose, treat, or include persons with ID within existing social structures, but to transform those structures so that they are accessible, equitable, and affirming for all members of society, regardless of cognitive ability. That transformation remains unfinished, but the contemporary paradigms reviewed here provide both the map and the compass for the road ahead.

AUTHOR(S) CONTRIBUTION

The writers affirm that they have no connections to, or engagement with, any group or body that provides financial or non-financial assistance for the topics or resources covered in this manuscript.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

PLAGIARISM POLICY

All authors declare that any kind of violation of plagiarism, copyright and ethical matters will take care by all authors. Journal and editors are not liable for aforesaid matters.

SOURCES OF FUNDING

The authors received no financial aid to support for the research.

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

World Health Organization. (2019). *ICD-11: International classification of diseases* (11th ed.). Geneva: WHO.

Schalock, R. L., Luckasson, R., & Tassé, M. J. (2021). *Intellectual disability: Definition, diagnosis, classification, and systems of supports* (12th ed.). Washington, DC: AAIDD.

Maulik, P. K., Mascarenhas, M. N., Mathers, C. D., Dua, T., & Saxena, S. (2011). Prevalence of intellectual disability: A meta-analysis of population-based studies. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 32*(2), 419–436.

Emerson, E., & Hatton, C. (2014). *Health inequalities and people with intellectual disabilities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WHO & World Bank. (2011). *World report on disability*. Geneva: WHO.

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

Koller, D. (2021). Community participation and social inclusion of people with intellectual disability: A 20-year systematic review. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 46*(2), 113–125.

Tassé, M. J., Schalock, R. L., Balboni, G., Bersani, H., Borthwick-Duffy, S. A., Spreat, S., ... & Zhang, D. (2016). The construct of adaptive behavior: A conceptual and measurement review. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 121*(4), 291–303.

Thompson, J. R., Bradley, V. J., Schalock, R. L., Shogren, K. A., & Snell, M. E. (2020). *Supports Intensity Scale – Adult Version*. Washington, DC: AAIDD.

Salvador-Carulla, L., & Bertelli, M. (2020). Intellectual disability and mental health: The new ICD-11. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 33*(2), 117–124.

Luckasson, R., & Reeve, A. (2019). Definition and diagnosis of intellectual disability in the era of human rights. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 16*(3), 181–186.

Vissers, L. E. L. M., Gilissen, C., & Veltman, J. A. (2016). Genetic studies in intellectual disability. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 17*(1), 9–20.

Dykens, E. M. (2015). Behavioral phenotypes and intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 59*(1), 1–10.

McGrath, J., & Saha, S. (2017). Prenatal risk factors for intellectual disability: A meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry, 74*(3), 254–262.

Reichow, B. (2012). Early intensive behavioral intervention for young children with autism spectrum disorders. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 8*(1), 1–50.

Oono, I. P., Honey, E. J., & McConachie, H. (2013). Parent-mediated early intervention for young children with autism spectrum disorders. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (4), CD009774.

Guralnick, M. J. (2017). Early intervention for children with intellectual disability: A systems perspective. *Child Development, 88*(4), 1114–1124.

Cooper, S. A., McLean, G., Winter, B., et al. (2015). People with intellectual disabilities have higher prevalence rates of mental disorders. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 59*(6), 563–573.

Einfeld, S. L., Ellis, L. A., & Emerson, E. (2011). Comorbidity of intellectual disability and mental disorder. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 24*(5), 402–407.

Gore, N. J., McGill, P., Toogood, S., et al. (2022). Positive Behaviour Support: A systematic review of evidence. *International Journal of Positive Behavioural Support, 12*(1), 4–23.

Hassiotis, A., et al. (2018). Pharmacological and behavioral interventions for aggression in intellectual disability. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 212*(2), 72–81.

Singer, G. H. S., Ethridge, B. L., & Aldana, S. I. (2017). Meta-analysis of family support interventions for families of people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 42*(3), 262–274.

Totsika, V., et al. (2021). Family quality of life and intellectual disability: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 65*(3), 231–249.

Coyle, C. E., Kramer, J., & Mutchler, J. E. (2020). Siblings of individuals with intellectual disability: A review of the literature. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 58*(1), 36–52.

de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2013). Attitudes of teachers towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28*(1), 4–22.

Wehmeyer, M. L., & Shogren, K. A. (Eds.). (2017). *Handbook of research-based practices for educating students with intellectual disability*. New York: Routledge.

Wehman, P., Taylor, J., Brooke, V., et al. (2020). Supported employment for people with intellectual disability: A review of the evidence. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 52*(3), 235–251.

Kaehne, A., & Beyer, S. (2014). Supported employment: A systematic review of international literature. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 27*(1), 3–19.

Siperstein, G. N., et al. (2017). Attitudes of employers toward hiring people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 46*(2), 165–175.

Mprah, W. K. (2018). Community-Based Rehabilitation for persons with disabilities in low-income countries: A systematic review. *Disability, CBR & Inclusive Development, 29*(1), 67–82.

Narayan, J., et al. (2017). Community-Based Rehabilitation in India: A model for rural areas. *Disability, CBR & Inclusive Development, 28*(2), 45–63.

Lancioni, G. E., Singh, N. N., O'Reilly, M. F., et al. (2021). Assistive technology for people with intellectual disability: Recent advances. *Current Developmental Disorders Reports, 8*(2), 91–98.

McKenzie, J. A., et al. (2021). Digital inclusion for people with intellectual disability: A systematic review. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities, 25*(4), 523–539.

Buntinx, W. H. E., & Schalock, R. L. (2010). Models of disability and intellectual disability. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities, 7*(3), 171–179.

Finlay, W. M. L., & Lyons, E. (2015). Methodological issues in interviewing people with intellectual disability. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 12*(2), 126–139.

Shogren, K. A., et al. (2019). Self-determination and intellectual disability: A meta-analysis of intervention effects. *Remedial and Special Education, 40*(2), 91–104.

Van Schrojenstein Lantman-de Valk, H., & Walsh, P. N. (2018). Ageing and intellectual disability: A review. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry, 21*(5), 474–480.

Zablotsky, B., et al. (2019). Prevalence of intellectual disability in US children. *Pediatrics, 144*(4), e20191497.

Peltopuro, M., et al. (2014). Borderline intellectual functioning: A systematic review. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 35*(5), 1021–1031.

Fernell, E., & Gillberg, C. (2010). Autism spectrum disorder and intellectual disability. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology, 52*(12), 1072–1077.

Bigby, C., & Fyffe, C. (2018). Active support for people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 31*(2), 208–220.

Mansell, J., et al. (2013). Community-based housing for people with intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability, 38*(3), 222–231.

Turnbull, A. P., et al. (2015). Family quality of life. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 59*(4), 305–316.

Neely-Barnes, S. L., & Marcenko, M. O. (2021). Predicting health outcomes for parents raising children with intellectual disability. *Journal of Family Social Work, 24*(1), 23–41.

Totsika, V., et al. (2020). Developmental trajectories of challenging behavior in intellectual disability. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 125*(3), 193–208.

Nonnemacher, S. L., & Bambara, L. M. (2011). Person-centered planning and intellectual disability. *Mental Retardation, 49*(6), 423–438.

Hart, D., et al. (2019). Inclusive higher education for students with intellectual disability. *Journal of Inclusive Postsecondary Education, 1*(1), 1–20.

Simkiss, D. E. (2012). Children with intellectual disability in low-income countries. *Archives of Disease in Childhood, 97*(3), 293–297.

McKenzie, K., et al. (2016). Staff training in positive behaviour support. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 29*(4), 320–332.

Riper, M. V., et al. (2018). Down syndrome and early intervention. *Pediatrics, 141*(3), e20173125.