

1 Experienced inclusion and recognition amongst people with 2 spinal cord injury: A comparative study in Norway, The 3 Netherlands, and Australia

4
5 Annelie Schedin Leiulfsrud^{1,2¶*}, Kristian Bernhof Ellinggard^{1¶}, Marcel W.M. Post^{3-4&}, Mohit Arora^{5-6&},
6 Håkon Leiulfsrud^{1¶}

7 ¹ Department of Spinal Cord Injuries St Olav University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway.

8 ² Department of Neuro Medicine and Movement Science, Norwegian University of Science and
9 Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

10 ³ Centre of Excellence for Rehabilitation Medicine, UMC Brain Center, University Medical Centre
11 Utrecht, Utrecht University and De Hoogstraat Rehabilitation, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

12 ⁴ University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, Centre for Rehabilitation
13 Groningen, The Netherlands.

14 ⁵ John Walsh Centre for Rehabilitation Research, Northern Sydney Local Health District, St
15 Leonards, New South Wales, Australia.

16
17 ⁶ School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney, Sydney,
18 New South Wales, Australia.

19
20
21 *Corresponding author

22
23 E-mail: annelie.s.leiulfsrud@ntnu.no

24
25 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work

26 &These authors also contributed equally to this work

27
28

29

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

30 **Abstract**

31 **Background**

32 The aim of this article is to study inclusion and recognition experienced amongst people with a
33 Spinal Cord Injury (SCI) in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. This is approached both from
34 the perspectives of an interest in the impact of mobility limitations versus social attitudes, and from
35 a consideration of differences between societies.

36 **Methods**

37 The data derive from the core questionnaire of International Spinal Cord Injury Community Survey
38 with extended national modules on the attitudes and values of respondents from Norway, The
39 Netherlands, and Australia. The data gathered in 2017-18 include 2'450 participants aged 18 years
40 or older. The data are analysed and presented with descriptive statistics and OLS regression
41 analyses. In order to explore our main questions, we run regression controlling for country effects in
42 addition exploring within country effects.

43 **Results**

44 Mobility limitations are a substantially weaker predictor of self-perceived inclusion and recognition
45 than experiences of negative attitudes towards disabled people. Stereotypical attitudes and norms in
46 society are shown to have various impacts on inclusion in the three countries. The Norwegian
47 respondents report overall better results on inclusion and recognition than respondents in Australia
48 and The Netherlands, illustrating the importance of national contexts.

49 **Conclusions**

50 Challenges associated with inclusion, recognition, and respect after SCI need to be defined in a
51 language broader than mobility limitations and stereotypical attitudes towards people with an SCI.
52 The main road to both inclusion and recognition in society is primarily linked to job and
53 educational status, in addition to family and friends. The results are of particular interest as

54 measures to support reintegration into society, including a strengthening of labour market
55 integration programs.

56

57 **Introduction**

58 This article aims to study inclusion and recognition experienced amongst people with a Spinal Cord
59 Injury (SCI) in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. In particular, we probe the relative impact
60 of 1) mobility limitations and 2) negative societal attitudes about disabled people and how study
61 participants experience inclusion and recognition. In addition, the cross-national research design
62 enables us to study national, as well as more general features of social inclusion and social
63 recognition.

64 In this article we introduce two types of constraints with a potential impact on self-perceived
65 inclusion and recognition. The *first* type of constraint is mobility limitations. Mobility limitations
66 may hamper moving around and access to public and private buildings but is also linked to
67 individual identity management and performance [1-3]. Since use of a wheelchair or other highly
68 visible mobility aids in public may represent a social stigma or sign of disability and exclusion [2,4]
69 it may be wise to distinguish between wheelchair users and those able to walk with or without
70 visible markers, such as crutches or canes. This is also an assumption in congruence with previous
71 research from The Netherlands, showing significant associations between categories of greater
72 mobility level (using an electric wheelchair, using a manual wheelchair, walking with aids or
73 walking without aids) with higher levels of overall level of well-being [5]. The *second* type of
74 constraint found in the disability literature stresses more general negative societal attitudes towards
75 disabled people in society as a strong predictor of social exclusion [6]. The two constraints lead us
76 to an assumption that mobility constraints directly (constraint 1) or indirectly through negative
77 attitudes in society (constraint 2) lead to a diminished sense of social inclusion. To learn more about
78 how these constraints are linked to perceptions of being an active and valuable member of society

79 may help us to gain a better understanding of how the social mechanisms at play impact individual
80 and collective perceptions of inclusion and recognition in different societies.

81

82 **Mobility constraints as a marker and potential obstacle to social trust** 83 **and social inclusion**

84 Mobility limitations as an inclusion factor in traditional rehabilitation literature tend to be described
85 in negative terms of a need of help, powerlessness, life space limitations and associated with bodily
86 impairment [7]. This is also shown in the description of those who are wheelchair-bound but
87 supplemented with a distinction between active wheelchair users as more empowered and socially
88 included, and passive wheelchair users as more depowered and socially excluded [7]. British
89 disability researchers, Sapey, Stewart and Donaldsen [8], departing from a social model analysis of
90 disablement, have described the wheelchair as both a liberator and an obstacle preventing full
91 participation. The participation limitations in the British study [8] are both illustrated by the nature
92 of the physical environment, and of perceived negative attitudes. Both of these studies are good
93 illustrations of different narratives and problem foci associated with being wheelchair-bound, but
94 none of them problematises potential differences between different types of mobility limitations –
95 including distinctions between those able to move around more or less independently and those
96 fully dependent on others. Nor does it differentiate between those who sit in a manual wheelchair
97 and those in an electric wheelchair.

98 The first distinction is of potential interest as it is linked to a narrative concerning those able
99 to move around more or less independently and those fully dependent on others. The second
100 distinction is of interest as it may differentiate between those who can manage with their own will
101 and body powers to get around, and those who are more dependent in terms of assistance. These
102 aspects of mobility limitations are of interest as they relate to how people with a physical disability
103 perceive themselves, believe others are experiencing them, or answer to questions of social trust in
104 others, and society more broadly.

105

106 **The relevance of societal factors in explaining social trust and social** 107 **inclusion**

108 In contrast to much of previous research on social trust, social policy, and welfare or disability
109 policy with an emphasis on more systemic features of society, our approach is to look more closely
110 into social inclusion as “lived experience”, i.e., adopting a focus on experiences of inclusion and
111 recognition in everyday life interactions with other people and in society. Our focus on social
112 recognition struggles and empowerment is in line with a growing body of research with a focus on
113 social recognition as the basis of social order and inclusion in society [9-10]. From this perspective,
114 being recognised by others opens the door to participating fully and being included in society.
115 Conversely, lack of recognition by others may be seen as a form of asymmetrical power relations
116 and an essential component of the process of social marginalisation and social exclusion [9, 11].
117 Social recognition of others is not *a priori* a matter of positive or negative attitudes, and as
118 illustrated by a study by Bollier et al. [12] in Australia in which a substantial part of respondents
119 end up answering, “I don’t know” on attitudes towards people with a disability. This is both a reply
120 that may be interpreted as genuine uncertainty or fear of being ideologically biased; it is also a way
121 of answering, revealing that social recognition potentially can be partial, ambiguous, or
122 contradictory.

123 The theories of Honneth and Fraser [9, 11] depart from an interest in individuals as well as
124 the institutions and social fabric of society. This is also of importance in a comparative study of
125 how perceptions of oneself and others as well as the social climate for disabled people are played
126 out in different societies. For our purpose, bringing societal factors into the analysis of experienced
127 mobility constraints may also be seen as an important mediator.

128

129 **Inclusion and social trust in a comparative perspective**

130 On paper, Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia share several similarities that may play out in an
131 analysis of perceptions of inclusion amongst people with SCI. All three societies are based on
132 overall high levels of social trust in fellow citizens, institutions, and society; social trust is generally
133 used as a proxy for high levels of social cohesion and social inclusion in society [13] All three
134 societies have well-developed social security systems in terms of health, pensions, and
135 unemployment [14-16]. The employment and relative poverty rates for people with a disability and
136 the threshold for receiving disability-related benefits are, however, substantially worse in Australia
137 than in either The Netherlands or Norway [17]. This may suggest a harsher social and economic
138 climate in Australia for disabled people if we restrict it to official social policy systems.

139 Both Australia and The Netherlands are characterized by more restricted and individualised
140 eligibility for social benefits than in a less strict and more generous eligibility for social benefits in
141 Norway – i.e., differences that potentially may trigger discontent or satisfaction in how people
142 perceive themselves as fully included and recognised or excluded and mis-recognised in society
143 [18]. Both Norway and Australia are heavily work-centered in their welfare and social policy
144 (aiming for full employment) whereas The Netherlands focuses on a policy of social inclusion
145 based on a more generic public rhetoric of participation in society with an emphasis on people's
146 well-being and community building [19].

147 To what extent and how potential differences in the organisation of public welfare
148 provisions and the official rhetoric of inclusion correspond to differences in subjective experiences
149 of inclusion for disabled people in daily life, however, is a more open question. National
150 representative panel data from Australia in 2018 (N= 2,061, response rate = 71%) lend support to
151 commonly held views of disabled people as easier to take advantage of, exploit, or treat badly, but
152 also of an uncertainty as to how to act in an appropriate way towards disabled people. Even if this
153 study reveals explicit or implicit negative stereotypical attitudes, and disempowerment, such as low
154 expectations towards disabled people, it is equally interesting to note that 78% were unsure how to
155 act towards disabled people, and that 42% agreed that people tend to ignore disabled people [12].

156 In line with Low and Pistaferri [18] we expect to find national differences in perceptions of
157 inclusion/recognition between Norway on the one hand, and Australia and The Netherlands on the
158 other hand, due to differences in disability and welfare systems and social policy. It may also be the
159 case that more systemic features of society are only loosely associated with how people with an SCI
160 perceive their inclusion and recognition in their own lives and as citizens. Sources of inclusion, and
161 social recognition of a more informal kind (family, friends, and community) may play a significant
162 role here.

163 Strictly speaking, our data do not fully cover the concept of social recognition, but focus on
164 whether the respondents feel that they are treated with respect. Even if respect and recognition may
165 differ theoretically in a larger philosophical discussion [9], there is also a substantial empirical
166 overlap between being valued as a significant person and being respected as a member of society
167 [20]. This provides the rationale for treating respect received from others as a measure of social
168 recognition in this article.

169

170 **Research questions**

171 RQ 1: To what extent are mobility limitations related to experiences of social inclusion/social
172 recognition?

173 RQ 2: To what extent are mobility limitations an important determinant of whether people with an
174 SCI feel included/socially recognised mediated by negative societal attitudes towards disabled
175 people?

176 RQ 3: To what extent are differences in experiences of social inclusion/social recognition explained
177 by country of residence?

178

179 The research questions are addressed with a focus on both factors explaining perceptions of
180 inclusion and recognition, and factors explained by differences between societies.

181

182 **Hypotheses**

183 Main Hypothesis: (1) Mobility limitations are related to experienced social inclusion and social
184 recognition; (2) the association between mobility limitations and experienced social inclusion/social
185 recognition is mediated by attitudes towards disabled people in society; (3) Levels of social
186 inclusion and recognition factors associated with them vary across societies. These mechanism are
187 presented schematically in Fig. 1:

188 **Fig 1. Schematic presentation of theoretichal mechanisms.**

189 The model presents the theoretichal mechanisms in which level of mobility might affect social
190 inclusion and recognition. The level of mobility of the respondent with SCI might have a direct
191 effect on perceived levels of social inclusion and recognition. This relationship might be moderated
192 by different confounders. The relationship might also be mediated by the experienced level of
193 attitudes towards people with disabilities.

194

195 **Material and methods**

196 **Data sources and sample**

197 This study utilised data from the International Spinal Cord Injury (InSCI) Community Survey. The
198 data derived from the core questionnaire with an extended national module on the attitudes and
199 values of respondents from Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia [21-22]. The InSCI survey was
200 conducted in Norway 19/10/2017 to 31/08/2018, in the Netherlands 01/01/2018 to 31/10/2018 and
201 in Australia 01/03/2018 to 31/01/2019. The study embraced persons with SCI (traumatic or
202 nontraumatic), aged 18 years or older, living in a community, and able to respond to one of the
203 available language alternatives in which the 125-item questionnaire was made available. In
204 Norway, potential participants were identified from the medical files of the three specialised SCI
205 rehabilitation centres in the country (Oslo, Trondheim, and Bergen) who had completed their first
206 rehabilitation in 2000-2016. This included 1,446 eligible persons and 611 respondents (response

207 rate 42%). In The Netherlands, potential participants were identified from the medical files of three
208 specialised rehabilitation centres in different parts of the country (Rotterdam, Utrecht, and
209 Groningen). Random samples were drawn from the pools of all former patients in each centre. A
210 total of 847 individuals were invited, and 260 (33%) participated in the study. In Australia, the data
211 were based on specialised SCI clinical services/units, not-for-profit community organisations, and
212 one government insurance agency in the states of New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia,
213 and Victoria with specialised spinal cord services. A total of 5,925 were invited, and 1,579
214 participated in the study (i.e., a response rate of 27%).

215

216 **Ethics statement**

217 The data collected in Norway, the Netherlands and Australia are all in compliance with national
218 laws and regulatory approvals by Institutional Review Boards or Ethics Committees. All methods
219 were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. In Norway and the Netherlands, the
220 participants provided their written informed consent by completing the survey (online or
221 paper/pencil). In Australia implied consent was obtained from all participants by completing the
222 survey questionnaire.

223 The Ethical Committees who approved the study were: Regionale komiteer for medisinsk og
224 helsefaglig forskningsetikk (Regional committees for medical and health research ethics) in Norway
225 (Reference number 2016/1184), Medish Ethische Toetsingscommissie (Medical Research Ethical
226 Committee) in Utrecht, the Netherlands (Reference number 17/539) and Northern Sydney Local
227 Health District, Australia (RESP/16/344).

228

229 **Sample description**

230 The analytic sample consisted of 2,450 respondents. The Australian sample [23] consisted of over
231 twice as many respondents as the Norwegian and the Dutch sample combined. Thus, the values of
232 the total sample were significantly affected by the Australian sample. We took this into account,
233 however, by either running the models separately for each of the three countries or applying the
234 countries as dummy variables.

235

236 **Dependent variables**

237 Both social inclusion and social recognition are elusive concepts difficult to measure and
238 operationalise. To best capture the different nuances, we utilized two variables that were thought to
239 measure inclusion and recognition, respectively. The first dependent variable *Inclusion* asks the
240 respondents “Do you feel included when you are with other people?” on a scale from 1 as *not at all*,
241 up to 5 as *completely*. The proportion who do not feel included (1-2) was higher for The
242 Netherlands (12%) and Australia (13%) respondents than in Norway (5%). The Netherlands and
243 Australia followed each other to some extent in the distribution, whilst the Norwegians had more
244 respondents placed higher up on the scale. For Norway, almost half of the sample (48.7%) felt
245 completely included in the company of others, compared to one-third in The Netherlands (33.3%)
246 and Australia (31.8%).

247 In order to measure the extent to which the respondents feel recognised, we apply the
248 Recognition scale, which ask “do you feel that people treat you with respect?”. Here, the
249 respondents place themselves on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 is *not at all* and 7 is *a great deal*.

250 We observed a similar pattern for recognition as we did with how people felt included.
251 41.5% of Norwegian respondents reported that they got a great deal of respect (value 7), compared
252 to 13.3% in The Netherlands and 28.1% in Australia. As seen in Table 1 and Table S1, most of the
253 respondents in all three societies felt that they were included and recognised by others, but with a
254 significantly higher proportion in Norway (8:10) than in The Netherlands and Australia (6:10).

255

257 **Table 1. Descriptive statistics displaying the dependent variables and the main explanatory**
 258 **variables. a**

	Norway (n= 517)	The Netherlands (n= 236)	Australia (n= 1,374)	Total (N= 2,127)
Dependent variables				
Included (range 1-5) (mean, sd)	4.25 (0.90)	3.85 (1.08)	3.79 (1.11)	3.91 (1.08)
Treated with respect (range 1-7) (mean, sd)	6.09 (1.00)	5.52 (1.13)	5.59 (1.32)	5.70 (1.25)
Independent variables				
Independence in Mobility				
Electrical wheelchair (%)	10%	17%	26%	21%
Manual wheelchair (%)	17%	31%	35%	30%
Walking with devices (%)	28%	26%	20%	23%
Walking without devices (%)	45%	26%	20%	26%
Attitudes barriers				
No influence/not applicable (%)	82%	73%	72%	74%
Made life harder (%)	18%	27%	28%	26%

259 a. The number of respondents for each country (Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia) and the
 260 total number of respondents. The mean and standard deviation are presented for both of the
 261 dependent variables and percentages for each of the levels of mobility and perceived social
 262 attitudes.

263

264 **Explanatory variables**

265 **Independence in mobility**

266 Mobility limitations were divided into four different categories. The first category included
 267 respondents who were completely dependent on help from others or use an electric wheelchair.
 268 Respondents in the second category were those using a manual wheelchair. Those in the third and
 269 fourth category could walk moderate distances with help from walking aids. Half of the respondents
 270 in this study were dependent on a wheelchair (21% electric wheelchair users vs. 30% manual

271 wheelchair users), one out of four (23%) could walk short distances with walking aids, and one out
272 of four (26%) were able to walk short distances without walking aids. The proportion of
273 participants depending on wheelchair use was substantially higher in Australia (60%) than in The
274 Netherlands (38%) and Norway (27.5), and conversely lower for people able to walk (with or
275 without walking aids) in Australia (40%) than in The Netherlands (62%) and Norway (72.5%).

276

277 **Negative attitudes towards people with a disability in society**

278 People with SCI are exposed to various external influences or environmental factors in daily life. A
279 question on social attitudes was included in the survey regarding these environmental factors,
280 namely “Thinking about the last 4 weeks, please rate how much these environmental factors have
281 influenced your participation in society.” Participants rated this item on a scale of 4, where 1 = Not
282 applicable, 2 = No influence, 3 = Made my life a little harder, and 4 = Made my life a lot harder.
283 These four categories were recoded as a dichotomous variable coded as “0” if not applicable or no
284 influence, and “1” if societal attitudes have made life a little harder or a lot harder. Two to three out
285 of ten feel that negative attitudes towards disabled people have made life more difficult for them
286 (18% in Norway, 26% in The Netherlands, and 28% in Australia).

287

288 **Control variables**

289 As control variables, we included gender, age group (based on age at the time of interview), level of
290 education, and job status. Female was coded as 1, male was coded as 0. Age was a categorical
291 variable. The level of education was coded as “0” with elementary schooling; “1” with completed
292 secondary education; “2” with completed university, whether they went on to graduate study or not.
293 The final control variable measured whether the respondents had been in remunerative work during
294 the previous seven days (no= 0, yes= 1). Thus, respondents who were still enrolled in school,
295 retired, or for some reason unemployed were categorised/classified as not in paid work.

296 We run two regressions utilising *ordinary least square regression*. The first explored the
297 relative impact of mobility limitations on experiences of social inclusion/social recognition
298 (research question 1) and its impact after controlling for negative societal attitudes towards disabled
299 persons (research question 2). The second focused on experiences of social inclusion and
300 recognition explained by country of residence.

301

302 **Results**

303 The results presented in Figure 2 lend limited and uneven support for mobility limitation as a factor
304 explaining experiences of social inclusion/social recognition (cf. research question 1).

305 **Fig 2. Plot comparing regression coefficients on the dependent variables included and**
306 **Recogniced controlling for countries.**

307 The plot is based on Table S2. It shows regression coefficients on the effect on the
308 experience of being included and the experience of recognition. The figure included the reference
309 category for each dummy set (reference categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or
310 using an electric wheelchair, male, low education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The
311 Netherlands).

312 The relative impact of negative societal attitudes towards disabled people is overall a much
313 stronger predictor of how people with an SCI experience social inclusion/social recognition (cf.
314 research question 2).

315 Walking without walking aids and age may have a positive effect on feelings of being
316 included in company with others but disappear as an effect as soon as we control for negative
317 attitudes towards people with a disability. Recognition, however, appears to be a more complex
318 case where those walking without walking aids report less respect from others than those dependent
319 on a wheelchair. Figure 2 also suggests that women with an SCI more often feel accorded respect
320 than men, and those who are older more often feel accorded respect than those of a younger age.
321 The results in figure 2 show that recognition is strongly linked to higher education and being

322 employed. It also reveals that Norwegian respondents report overall better results on inclusion and
323 recognition than respondents in Australia and The Netherlands.

324 With regard to the mediation effects of social attitudes, the results are mixed. Environmental
325 factors of social attitudes have a negative and significant effect on both inclusion and recognition.
326 Inclusion of social attitudes affects the p-value of the main explanatory variable of mobility, going
327 from significant to not significant. This suggests that there might be some mediating effect of social
328 attitudes on the relationship between mobility and inclusion. In terms of recognition, walking
329 without aids becomes significant and negative in relation to the being completely dependent on an
330 electric wheelchair. However, since the relationship between mobility and recognition did not have
331 a significant association prior to the inclusion of social attitudes, we cannot show a potential
332 mediation effect in our study. Figure 3 and Figure 4 presents the coefficient plots for both inclusion
333 and recognition for each of the three countries.

334

335 **Fig 3. Regression coefficients. Dependent variable: Inclusion.** The plot is based on Table S3. It
336 shows regression coefficients on the effect on the experience of being included for The Netherlands,
337 Norway, and Australia. The figure includes the reference category for each dummy set (reference
338 categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or using an electric wheelchair, male, low
339 education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The Netherlands).

340 **Fig 4. Regression coefficients. Dependent variable: Recognition.** The plot is based on Table S3.
341 It shows regression coefficients on the effect on the experience of recognition for The Netherlands,
342 Norway, and Australia. The figure includes the reference category for each dummy set (reference
343 categories are: completely dependent of wheelchair or using an electric wheelchair, male, low
344 education, not paid work, no influence/applicable, and The Netherlands).

345 Our initial hypothesis that mobility limitations may impact experiences of social
346 inclusion/social recognition received some support in The Netherlands where both manual
347 wheelchair users and those walking without walking aids reported higher levels of social inclusion

348 and social recognition. An impact on social recognition of walking without walking aids was also
349 found in Australia, albeit as a negative factor. This hypothesis received no support in the Norwegian
350 data.

351 For both Norway and Australia, it was observed that the participants' sense of inclusion is
352 heavily dependent on their status as employed or not. In The Netherlands it is primarily gender, in
353 addition to mobility status, not employment, that explains differences in how people with an SCI
354 perceive their inclusion in society.

355 In Norway, it was observed that gender, age, and education play a role in how the
356 respondents report being recognised by others, whereas gender disappears after introducing
357 negative attitudes towards disabled people in society. In The Netherlands, recognition is primarily
358 associated with mobility status, age, and education, after controlling for negative attitudes towards
359 disabled people. In both Norway and The Netherlands having a high education compared to lower
360 education is positively associated with recognition. This is, however, not the case in the Australian
361 sample. In addition to mobility status, and paid work, older people in Australia were more often
362 report that they felt socially recognised than people of a younger age. Interestingly, walking without
363 aids in the Australian sample, negatively associated with recognition compared to being completely
364 dependent, having a different effect compared to The Netherlands.

365 In summary, these results show that both explanations departing from impairment and
366 mobility constraints (i.e., constraints typically represented in the rehabilitation literature) and
367 discrimination towards disabled people in society are robust factors in explaining social inclusion
368 and social recognition. At the same time, we also find a more complex picture than initially
369 expected.

370

371 **Discussion**

372 We initially started out with a hypothesis (H1) that mobility limitations are related to self-perceived
373 experienced social inclusion and social recognition (see also research question 1). This was based

374 on an interest in how physical mobility constraints impact social participation with a focus on both
375 perceptions on individual inclusion and social recognition from other people. It was also based on
376 an interest in whether it is physical mobility, or the symbolic signs associated with a disability that
377 matter most in how people with a physical impairment perceive themselves. We find some support
378 in both the Dutch and the Australian data that walking without walking aids may have an impact on
379 social recognition, albeit in opposite directions from those depending on an electric wheelchair.
380 Whereas no visible signs of a prototypical impairment may be an asset, signaling “normality” and
381 “sameness”- i.e., no deviance in public, it may also represent a challenge. This is particularly so if
382 we depart from a social recognition perspective, where an initial impairment is less visible and
383 obvious, and therefore potentially mis-recognised as a constraint and personal challenge in the
384 public sphere. This is also personal challenges that has been described in previous studies in other
385 minor groups, including minor stroke [24], chronic fatigue [25] and pain [26].

386 It is also interesting to observe that the cultural marker in The Netherlands is not necessary
387 between wheelchair users and those able to walk without walking aids but associated with mobility
388 status (where both those able to walk and those sitting in a manual wheelchair more often report
389 that they are socially recognised than in those in an electric wheelchair). The weak correlations
390 between mobility status and social recognition are also an illustration of a factor highly dependent
391 on society, culture, and attempts to strive for a culture of “normality” and a discourse of disability
392 [27].

393 We expected to find an empirical correlation between mobility limitations and individual
394 perceptions of inclusion/social recognition mediated by negative attitudes towards people with a
395 disability (H2). Even if this hypothesis receives some support in The Netherlands and Australia, the
396 overall strongest predictor of both social inclusion and social recognition is negative attitudes
397 towards disabled people. Our answer to research question 2 is accordingly that negative encounters
398 of a personal or more generic kind towards disabled people are essential in any study of social
399 inclusion and social recognition. This is also a result in line with a broad range of disability research

400 [3, 6] and more general literature on social recognition as a key to understand social inclusion [11,
401 9, 28]. The main difference of the approach taken in this article from what may be found in the
402 literature above is that we focus upon experiences of inclusion and recognition based on extensive
403 quantitative data from people with an SCI rather than more general domains of participation and
404 inclusion in society.

405 We expected to find differences in how people with an SCI experienced social inclusion and
406 social recognition across the three societies (cf. H3, and research question 3). This was based
407 mainly on more general assumptions of societal traits found in social welfare and social policy
408 literature where both Australia and The Netherlands typically (and in line with Canada, the United
409 Kingdom, and the USA) are described as more liberal, consumer-, and market- oriented in their
410 approach towards disability and health. In contrast to both Australia and The Netherlands we
411 initially expected to find overall better results in terms of inclusion, recognition, and negative
412 reporting of discrimination of people with a disability in Norway. This was also an idea based on
413 our knowledge of differences in means testing of disability aid and welfare services, potentially
414 associated with more stigma in both Australia and The Netherlands than in more comprehensive
415 unconditional means testing programs in Norway. The data lend some support for a fit between type
416 of society and how people with a disability perceive their inclusion and recognition as persons in a
417 society, where Norway ends up with overall better results than either Australia or The Netherlands.
418 It is nonetheless difficult to interpret individual behavior as a response to differences in welfare
419 social policy and disability policy without considering alternative sources of inclusion and
420 recognition that may compensate for institutional and more systemic limitations and constraints.

421 Norway may on paper be more disability-friendly based on its commitment to personalised
422 services but does not necessarily score as well on social capital in the community and assistance
423 from family and friends. Australia scores overall surprisingly low on disability-friendly measures in
424 an OECD context [17] but may also have the relative advantage of a more community- and family-
425 based model of inclusion. The Netherlands has overall higher scores on disability-friendly measures

426 in an OECD context than in Australia [18] but its differences in terms of mobility status and the
427 significance of prototypical disability markers mark it out as taking a distinct path from Norway and
428 Australia. To what extent this may be explained by a more pronounced disability discourse based
429 on individual identity management and performativity [2, 3]) or moral imperatives associated with
430 inclusion and expectations to strengthen the well-being of those with disabilities [19] remains to be
431 researched. This is also a question of more general interest as the results for The Netherlands in
432 contrast to both Norway and Australia, show a weak link to social inclusion and social recognition
433 via employment as the main road to both inclusion and recognition in society.

434

435 **Study Limitations**

436 The study was limited in size, and with an uneven response rate. Ideally, we would have liked to
437 have included more countries and countries representing a broader range of health and welfare
438 systems. All data are based on self-reporting, not allowing for full validation of the data used. As
439 noted, the differences in the final sample within each country produced some limitations concerning
440 the comparability between the three countries. Whilst Norway and The Netherlands, to some extent,
441 consisted of a similar sample, the Australian sample differed slightly. For instance, a higher share of
442 the respondents in the Australian sample had a complete level of SCI compared to the Norwegian
443 sample. In addition, the average time since the onset of SCI was twice as high in Australian, again,
444 compared to the Norwegian sample. Taken together, these variations could lead to biased results.

445 The measures used are proxies for the concepts we wanted to measure. The question about
446 being treated with respect by others may be regarded as a more individualised construct than social
447 recognition, which is a broader sociological category also including the social bonds and the
448 solidarity that constitutes groups, communities, and society. Our use of *respect*, however, is
449 primarily framed in sociological language as our focus is on social and societal factors impacting
450 how people with a disability perceive themselves in different societies.

451 **Conclusions**

452 Our departure in this article differs from the approaches taken in previous literature in several
453 respects. First, the article highlights and problematises the nexus between mobility limitations in
454 everyday life and perceptions of inclusion and social recognition. Second, we did not restrict our
455 research to one society but examined how this nexus is played out in three distinct societies, with
456 data from Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia.

457 Our results lend some support to a general assumption that a focus on mobility limitations
458 may have an impact on how people with an SCI perceive themselves, including whether they
459 consider themselves included and fully recognised by others in society. This is, however, a rather
460 limited focus if we compare it to the challenges people with an SCI face when it comes to negative
461 attitudes and stereotypical attitudes in Norway, The Netherlands, and Australia. In line with this, it
462 is obvious that both people with an SCI and their relative's post-SCI must cope with and adjust to
463 the challenges associated with disability in society.

464 The article confirms that there are significant physical barriers and obstacles for people with
465 an SCI in all three nations to move around due to the degree of impairment, i.e., problems
466 traditionally addressed in disability and equal access policy, and in a vocabulary of accessible,
467 usable and universal design (see also United Nations – Article 9 on Accessibility as a mechanism to
468 secure social inclusion in the UN Convention of Human rights for people with a disability [29]).

469 At the same time, we find an even stronger social and cultural dimension linked to societal
470 factors in attitudes linked to social recognition and perception of Self and Others. This may not
471 come as a big surprise but is interesting as it must be read considering different welfare regimes and
472 national policy contexts, and ways to handle disability in social policy and practice. It is also of
473 interest, as we move from a broader societal context to an interest in actors and social interactions
474 between people. Once we bring in the social interaction and social space, we also observe that
475 mobility limitations are not just a matter of physical constraints, but also a question of how a
476 wheelchair or mobility aids, associated with different sets of cultural stereotypes, can function.

477 Rather than being an asset, our results suggest that an SCI without the necessary stereotypical
478 attributes (read dependent on a wheelchair) may be an obstacle in terms of being fully recognised as
479 a person.

480 In a context of recognition, and social inclusion in society, people with a disability are not
481 just of interest as individuals or a group, but also in terms of their social roles and resources. This is
482 particularly important in an inquiry about social recognition. Societal roles linked to work and
483 employment, and resources such as educational capital, are to a high extent status markers and
484 social distinctions of importance how individuals see and perceive themselves, and how they are
485 seen and perceived by others [9, 20].

486 The results support previous research that both higher education and employment are
487 essential in how people with an SCI perceive themselves and are perceived by others [27]. The
488 results also lend support to a picture where women with an SCI more often feel accorded respect
489 than men, and those older more often feel accorded respect than those of a younger age. This fits
490 rather well with a theoretical understanding of social recognition as norm structures and systems
491 that are more heavily embedded in the cultural discourse for men compared to women, and amongst
492 younger compared to elderly. People age 50+ have also in previous SCI research in Norway been
493 found to be more prone to say that they feel that they have done their societal duty as citizens based
494 on their previous work careers and track records [27].

495 The results lend some support to identifying commonalities across societies, but also to
496 specifying national differences with respect to the importance of employment and higher education
497 as social status and social recognition markers/distinctions. The results from The Netherlands are of
498 particular interest as they appear to support a narrative of inclusion and recognition via a general
499 idea of social participation and capability, in contrast to more conventional status markers as higher
500 education and employment in Norway and Australia.

501 More research is needed to fully understand the interplay between self-perceived
502 experiences of being included and recognised by others, and a more generalised recognition of

503 people with a disability in society. Our results are, nonetheless, a strong reminder that health
504 professionals in charge of the rehabilitation of people with an SCI must pay more attention to
505 societal factors and social barriers associated with disability. We also found confirmation of the
506 notion that it is not necessarily mobility limitations that are the main challenge in everyday life, but
507 rather the stereotypical attitudes and norms people encounter. Stereotypical attitudes and norms in
508 society are also shown to have diverse impacts on recognition in the three countries.

509 Attitudes (personal as well as more generalised attitudes) are not in themselves a mirror of
510 how people behave or act. Attitudes interpreted as prevailing value systems in societies, may also
511 be of a more ambivalent and contradictory nature (in support of official hegemonic norms, yet
512 ambivalent or not fully considered as in the case of public attitudes towards disabled people [12].
513 Nonetheless, we argue that an international comparative survey addressed to disabled people is
514 crucial for our understanding of commonalities and variations in how social recognition is lived and
515 perceived for people with a spinal cord injury.

516

517 **References**

- 518 1. Ridolfo H, Ward BW. Mobility impairment at the construction of identity. First
519 Forum Press. Boulder, Co; 2013.
- 520
- 521 2. Grue J. The social meaning of disability: a reflection on categorisation, stigma and
522 identity. *Social Health and Illness*. 2016; 38(6): 957–964.
523 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12417>
- 524
- 525 3. Darling RB. Disability and identity – Negotiating self in a changing society. Lynn
526 Rienner Publishers. Boulder. Co; 2019.
- 527
- 528 4. Cahill SE, Eggleston R. Reconsidering the stigma of physical disability,

- 529 Wheelchair Use and Public Kindness. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 2016; 36(4): 681–698.
- 530 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1995.tb00460.x>
- 531
- 532 5. Osterthun R, Postma K, van den Berg RHJ, Stolwijk J, Tepper M, Post MWM. Hoe ervaren
- 533 mensen met verschillende mobiliteit na een dwarslaesie hun gezondheid, functioneren en
- 534 welbevinden? [Associations between mobility level and levels of health, functioning and
- 535 well-being]. *Ned Tijdschr Revalidatiegeneeskd* 2021; 43(2): 32-36.
- 536 <https://www.revalidatie.nl/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/NTR-2021-2.pdf>
- 537
- 538 6. Oliver M, Barnes C. Back to the future: the world report on disability.
- 539 *Disability and Society*. 2012; 27(4): 575–579.
- 540 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.686781>
- 541
- 542 7. Schirghuber J, Schrems B. Being wheelchair-bound and being bedridden: Two
- 543 concept analyses. *Nursing Open*. 2023;10(4): 2075-2087. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1455>
- 544
- 545 8. Sapey B, Stewart J, Donaldsen G. Increases in wheelchair use and perceptions
- 546 of disablement. *Disability and Society*. 2005; 20(5): 489-505.
- 547 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09687590500156162>
- 548
- 549 9. Honneth A. Recognition and justice: Outline of a plural theory of justice”. *Acta*
- 550 *Sociologia*. 2004; 47(4): 351–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699304048668>
- 551
- 552 10. Ricouer P. *The Course of Recognition*. Cambridge. Harvard University Press; 2007.
- 553
- 554 11. Fraser N. Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*; 2003; 3: 107-120.

555

556 **12.** Bollier AM, Sutherland G, Krnjacki L, Kasidis V, Katsikis G,

557 Ozge J, et. al. Attitudes Matter: Findings from a national survey

558 of community attitudes toward people with disability in Australia. Centre of Research

559 Excellence in Disability and Health. The University of Melbourne. 2021. doi:

560 <https://doi.org/10.26188/15176013>

561

562 **13.** OECD. Trust in government (indicator). 2022 doi: 10.1787/1de9675e-en. Available from:

563 <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/b407f99c->

564 [en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/b407f99c-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/b407f99c-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/b407f99c-en)

565

566 **14.** Esping-Andersen G. The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton, New

567 York: Princeton University Press; 1990.

568

569 **15.** Headey B, Goodin RE, Muffels R, Dirven HJ. Welfare Over Time: Three

570 Worlds of Welfare Capitalism in Panel Perspective. Journal of Public Policy. 1997; 17(3):

571 329-359. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X00008576>

572

573 **16.** Aspalter C. Different Worlds of Welfare Capitalism: Australia, the United

574 States, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Germany, Italy, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

575 Australian National University Discussion Paper. 2010, December. (80). Available at

576 SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1725128>

577

578 **17.** OECD. Sickness, disability, and work. Breaking the barriers. Norway, Switzerland

579 and Polen. Paris. OECD. 2010. Available from: <https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues->
580 [migration-health/sickness-disability-and-work-breaking-the-barriers_9789264088856-](https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/sickness-disability-and-work-breaking-the-barriers_9789264088856-en#page1)
581 [en#page1](https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/sickness-disability-and-work-breaking-the-barriers_9789264088856-en#page1)

582

583 **18.** Low H, Pistaferri L. Disability Insurance and the Dynamics of the Incentive

584 Insurance Trade-Off. *American Economic Review*. 2015; 105(10): 2986–3029.

585 DOI: 10.1257/aer.20110108

586

587 **19.** Freitas MJ, Dassen J, Louali S, Sniekers M, Van Lieshout C, Wevers C.

588 Inclusive Society and Social Work: The Netherlands. In: Bundschuh S, M.J

589 Freitas MJ, Bartroli CP, Žganec N. (eds) *Ambivalences of Inclusion in Society*

590 and Social Work. *European Social Work Education and Practice*. Springer, Cham; 2021

591

592 **20.** Sayer A. *Class, Moral Worth and Recognition*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.

593 SAGE Publications; 2005.

594

595 **21.** Gross-Hemmi MH, Post MWM, Ehrmann C, Fekete C, Hasnan N, Middleton JW, et. al.

596 Study protocol of the international Spinal Cord Injury (InSCI) Community Survey.

597 *American Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2017; 96(2): 523-534.

598 <https://doi.org/10.1097/phm.0000000000000647>

599

600 **22.** Fekete C, Brach M, Ehrmann C, Post MWM, InSCI, Stucki G,

601 et. al. Cohort Profile of the International Spinal Cord Injury Community Survey

602 Implemented in 22 Countries. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2020;

603 101:12103–2111. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2020.01.022>

604

- 605 **23.** Middleton JW, Arora M, Kifley A, Geraghty T, Borg SJ, Marshall R, et.al. Australian arm
606 of the International Spinal Cord Injury (Aus-InSCI) community survey: 1. population-based
607 design, methodology and cohort profile. *Spinal Cord*. 2023 Mar;61(3):194-203.
608 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41393-022-00850-6>
609
- 610 **24.** Zheng Z, Song R, Zhao Y, Lv H, Wang Y, Yu C. 2023. An investigation of the
611 stigma and the factors influencing it in the rehabilitation of young and middle-aged stroke
612 patients – a cross-sectional study. *BMC Neurology* 23: 139. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-023-03189-4)
613 [023-03189-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12883-023-03189-4)
614
- 615 **25.** Froehlich L, Hattesoehl DB, Cotler J, Jason LA, Scheibenbogen C, Behrends U.
616 Causal attributions and perceived stigma for myalgic encephalomyelitis/ chronic fatigue
617 syndrome. *Journal of Health Psychology*. 2022; 27(10): 2291-2304.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1177/13591053211027631>
619
- 620 **26.** De Ruddere L, Craig KD. Understanding stigma and chronic pain: a-state-of
621 the-art review. *Pain*. 2016; 157(8): 1607-1610.
622 <https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000000512>
623
- 624 **27.** Leiulfstrud AS. Exploring Persons With a Spinal Cord Injury Participation in
625 Society: The Paradoxes of the Participation Dimension in the International
626 Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). Doctoral Thesis NTNU
627 2016:324.Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. ISBN:
628 978-82-326-1987-0
629
- 630 **28.** Gimmler A. Recognition: Conceptualization and context. In: Leiulfstrud H,

631 Sohlberg P (Eds). Concepts in Action. Leiden, Boston. Brill; 2018.

632

633 **29.** United Nations – Article 9. Accessibility.

634 Available from:

635 <https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/article-9-accessibility>

636

637 **Supporting information**

638 **S1 Table. Results on the questions on “social inclusion” and “people respect” in Norway, The**
639 **Netherlands and Australia.**

640

641 **S2 Table. Regression effect on perceived inclusion and recognition.** Controlling for country.

642

643 **S3 Table. Regression table for the effect on perceived inclusion and recognition for Norway,**
644 **The Netherlands, and Australia.**

645




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4